DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 039 843 HE 001 569

AUTHOR	Mayhew, Lewis B.
TITLE	The Literature of Higher Education During 1969.
INSTITUTION	American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	82p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington D.C. 20036 ($2.00)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.20
DESCRIPTORS	*Annotated Bibliographies, *Bibliographies, Books, College Teachers, Curriculum, Governance, *Higher Education, *Literature Reviews, Students

ABSTRACT

This extensively annotated bibliography of materials on higher education published in 1969 is divided in seven categories: (1) educational theory and policy; (2) curricular matters; (3) governance, organization and administration; (4) problems of different types of institutions; (5) drugs and students; (6) teachers and teaching; and (7) bibliographies and guides. A list of books received, but not reviewed, is included, as well as an index of the authors and titles reviewed. (AF)

ED0 39843

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Literature of Higher Education During 1969

Lewis B. Mayhew

Published by
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Single copy: $2. Quantity orders at the following discounts: 2-9 copies 10 percent; 10 or more copies 20 percent. Order from and make checks payable to AAHE at One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D. C. 20036.

HE 001 569

CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Educational Theory and Policy 3

Curricular Matters 15

Governance, Organization, and Administration 33

Problems of Different Types of Institutions 47

Drugs and Students 56

Teachers and Teaching 61

Bibliographies and Guides 64

Received but Unreviewed 68

Index of Authors and Titles 71

Introduction

There was more published literature on higher education in 1969, more of it was research-based, and it was of generally higher quality than in previous years. But it also reveals some of the usual gaps and uncovers a number of issues that are far from being resolved.

First among these issues is how "relevant" education should be (with "relevant" loosely referring to just about anything students perceive and accept). Writers are divided on whether institutions and their faculties should seek to accommodate student desires and demands, or whether students should be expected to conform to some ideal. Similarly, there is division on whether colleges should try to reform society or remain above it, the better to reflect objectively about the human condition. Scholars such as Jacques Barzun and J. Douglas Brown, without taking an extreme stand, seem to favor remoteness, while Harold Taylor and William Birenbaum feel that institutions must be directly involved in the affairs of society.

Another issue—more often implicit than not—is the proper degree of faculty control. There is general recognition that collegiate governance is far from satisfactory. But John Millett clearly feels that faculty should not assume control; Immanuel Wallerstein anticipates disaster unless they do just that; and most of the other authors struggle for balance between these two views.

Several authors wonder whether the arts can or should be central in institutional and perhaps national life. There appears to be considerable sentiment that they should be, but mixed opinion as to whether or not they can be. Similarly divided between hope and reality are the opinions about innovation, with nearly all of those who ponder the matter favoring it, but with considerable skepticism about whether institutions will really embrace new ideas unless they are compelled to do so.

Considering all the press coverage of black studies, the amount of treatment given this subject in monographic form is surprisingly small. But what there is establishes a significant split between those who would make massive efforts to create special programs and administrative units and those who would wait until full academic respectability has been accorded black studies. However, a related issue, that of the stringency of admissions criteria, seems to be being resolved by broadening both the base from which students are selected and the standards they must meet. Also discussed is the question of whether or not colleges really have a significant impact on the lives of their students. The debate, which began in 1957 when Jacob published his *Changing Values in College*, continues this year, with considerable evidence presented on both sides. Most writers seem to hope the colleges do, but evidence that they do not is hard to explain away.

The biggest issue is still the nature of the student revolt. Here the lines are clear and fixed. There are the apologists for youth, including some who are young enough to qualify as spokesmen, and those who believe a time has come to call a halt to student demands for equality within the university. This is a new development, for in the first few years after Berkeley the tone of most of the published literature about students was that of seeking to understand and meet student demands. But in 1969 a scholarly backlash seems to have set in as respected professors raise their voices against student protest, especially its methods.

A word should be said about publishers. Jossey-Bass, Inc., emerged in 1969 as the biggest single producer of works about higher education, and its output is attractive and of a generally high quality. Much of the work does reflect a developmental point of view, leading perhaps to some distortion of the nature of higher education. But the entire effort is so valuable that only praise can be offered. Another publisher that has emerged as a significant force is Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., which is bringing important research results to the attention of the profession. Generally these are not as attractive typographically as the Jossey-Bass books, but are of comparable substantive quality.

A disproportionate amount of the literature of 1969 seemed to consist of edited volumes. Frequently these books contain outstanding essays, the existence of which is not revealed by the titles of the collections. A bibliography of papers included in edited volumes is long overdue.

Gaps in literature can be as revealing as what is actually present. There is little concerning faculty members. In spite of impressive research over the past several years, there are no book-length treatments of statewide governance. Graduate education and science policy received little attention. Aside from the several monographs of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, finance and the economics of higher education were not adequately covered. And there were few histories, institutional or otherwise.

Educational Theory and Policy

Joseph Axelrod *et al.*, in *Search for Relevance: The Campus in Crisis* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969), have almost codified the conventional liberal reformist beliefs about the ailments of higher education and the appropriate prescriptions for curing them. The authors review the litany of the failure of American higher education, the facts that teaching has been mostly uninfluential, that the curriculum has not seemed to affect student values or life styles, and that the whole pattern of collegiate academic life is highly stylized and unlikely to affect human behavior. But students do change during the four years of college, more radically in some kinds of institutions than in others. When the dynamics of such change are examined, the power of primary group relationships with peers is shown to be salient. Such an examination produces a series of diagnoses and prescriptions. Depersonalization is corrected by creating relatively small primary groups. Fragmented departmentalized courses are remedied by creating longer blocks of course material, each of which flows into the other. Isolation from real life is rectified by contriving intrusions into the community. Ineffective teaching through telling is changed to a genuine dialectic. Unhealthy emphasis on grades as such is replaced by reviewing the judgmental function from the teacher. And regulation of student life is replaced by a new pattern of student freedoms and self-controls.

The obvious implication of such postulates is the probable success of several new experimental models of college education. These include the cluster college idea, a curriculum emphasizing realistic Utopian thinking, a systems approach to full institutional organization, and a much-liberated freshman year program emphasizing new kinds of courses, frequently invented and sometimes taught by students. The possibilities of these experimental models have been reasonably well established through research, but the authors do not really discuss why these promising ideas for reform have not been more generally accepted. The book is felicitously written, and the chapters do mesh, although one suspects that they were originally written independently, and for quite disparate purposes. The bibliography is impressive and probably comes close to being definitive of the literature of contemporary collegiate reform. As in several other of the books which emphasize a developmental theory of education, one could only wish that the ideas of several experienced administrators from large, complex institutions had been included. They could have discussed the serious logistical problems which model colleges must experience if they attempt reform.

Jacques Barzun has joined the mounting chorus of those trying to interpret American education in *The American University: How It Runs, Where It is Going* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969). Barzun establishes his thesis that since World War II a new university has emerged, qualitatively and quantitatively different. Growth in size and proliferation of services have produced a vast, inhuman monster resembling most nearly the medieval guild which attempted to do everything for the town.

A central problem is the faculty, now largely recruited not because of members' ability to teach or to be scholars but because of their high visibility on a national scene which more and more values prestige above all other virtues. This search for prestige has led to raiding or recruiting policy and has made institutions ready to tempt a recognized name with even a no-teaching-load appointment. This for the most part *in absentia* professor must minister to students who have never learned to handle language, to discipline themselves, or to accept the demonstrable fact that some people are better than others. This generation of students has been nurtured on excitement: hence they are inclined to resist the drudgery which must accompany discipline. They are opposing not the university or the war in Vietnam, but all of modern life; and this opposition takes on, in quite symbolic form, many of the attributes of the early Christian movement. This generation of college youth, not having appropriate role models, grows up with no sense of personal responsibility or of the fitness of things. Hence, they feel it is quite appropriate to steal books, refuse to pay library fines, or to cry tyranny when arrested for acts demonstrably against society.

Dealing with these two forces, college administrators have struggled against abuse and with diminishing resources, seeing their essential powers eroded by a jet-propelled faculty and an ill-behaved student body. It is true that all of higher education is in serious financial trouble, but this has been brought on in part by a deliberately contrived driven-into-bankruptcy attitude in the midst of plenty. As institutions have entered into more and more complex research ventures and have undertaken service roles, they have spent immeasurably more than they could possibly gain. A prestige institution could conceivably accept so many research contracts and grants that it would literally be forced into bankruptcy. Some theorists have viewed the new university as having traveled so far down the road to self-destruction that it can never be saved. However, Barzun feels that it can be if its leaders and members have the moral courage to make requisite changes. The most important of these would be to simplify, reduce, and adopt a very parsimonious program of activities. Courses should be cut out of the catalog, research curtailed, and much off-campus service eliminated.

The book, like so many other pieces of Barzun's writing, is an amazing blend of penetrating insight, well-styled and structured language, and arrogant dismissal of potentially relevant information. Thus his judgments about what happens to the holders of a master's degree are decidedly parochial. Only a handful of institutions, such as Columbia, regard this degree as a badge of dishonor. Barzun has apparently not looked into the growing amount of evidence about programs which are training, quite successfully, college administrators. Nor has he looked at the rich literature on psychometrics, including the uses of objectively-scored tests. The book will probably never draw the readership of the earlier *Teacher in America,* but it is nonetheless a useful addition to the critical literature about higher education in the post-World War II decades.

A different sort of critic is **Alvin C. Eurich,** who has codified his long-recognized ideas in *Reforming American Education* (New York: Harper &

Row, 1969). Eurich questions a number of common assumptions about education, such as the validity of a fixed student-teacher ratio or of local control. He believes new postulates should be basic for planning education. (Examples include his convictions that everything a student learns he must learn for himself, no matter how a teacher paces the instruction each student will learn at his own rate, and virtually anything can be taught to any student at any age in an intellectually honest form.) Eurich believes that public policy now favors innovation, and that such experiments as those concerning television or programmed learning have shown that truly innovative education is now possible. He even believes that the Education Commission of the States has invented a bureaucratic mechanism for truly reforming education.

Eurich does not distort facts. There has been an amazing range of experiments, many of which have never been publicized. What he does not mention is the number of experiments which were successful but still did not affect the practice of education in older, more traditional ways. In a sense, the book is Utopian, although the author plainly believes his ideas could be realized. Eurich has decidedly been a healthy influence in American higher education, and his influence will be extended by this current book. Even if most of his notions aren't generally accepted, it is good that his ideas are available to us.

Kingman Brewster and others have lectures in *Educating for the Twenty-First Century* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1969). These four lectures were given during the final week of the centennial celebration of the University of Illinois and deal with the future of formal education, science and technology, the competent city, and the future university as tool or maker of policy. Brewster's essay is somewhat Utopian in that he believes educational technology will assume a larger and larger role (despite the fact that a recent lecturer on his own campus could not use slides because there was no appropriately placed electrical outlet). Then Don K. Price describes the enormous achievements of science and suggests that those achievements have destroyed the American political dream of a nation in which all men shared equally in the knowledge and power by which they are governed. While he does not say so, the author strongly implies that the scientist, once he attunes himself to the larger society, could occupy a role not unlike that of Plato's philosopher kings.

The next essay simply reminds us that the nation has been urbanized, and that the resulting problems will not be solved until universities begin to concentrate on them. And Charles Frankel sees the university emerging in the next century to occupy an even more important position than it now does. He believes that the university will take over the role of the Church in the Middle Ages. The university's involvement in foreign policies will probably follow one of two approaches. The first, the classical approach to foreign policy, assumes continuous antagonism between powers, with the concept of the national interest being the touchstone for the use of such tools as the university. The second option rejects this conflict between powers, dwelling instead upon relations between societies. In this second context he sees the university playing a much more creative role as the maker of foreign policy. This is an interesting collection of four essays given by thoughtful men. Only time can show how perceptive their predictions were.

Carl Kaysen has put together several essays under the heading *The Higher Learning: The Universities and the Public* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969). These essays elaborate the thesis that the basis on which public support of higher education has been asked and provided does not correspond with what universities are actually doing. Universities, of course, are asked to create new knowledge, transmit new knowledge, use knowledge to solve society's practical problems, and to teach late adolescents and young adults how to fit into their future social roles. Much public regard for higher education was created when American institutions concentrated on transmitting information and socializing the young into an elite. Only recently have institutions ostensibly devoted their prime attention to science and scholarship, and only a few institutions pay really close attention to those matters. For a number of reasons, educators have been able to convince public officials that they should help make decisions on resource allocations. This is indeed unique in public administration, for no other large government program leaves decisions on resource allocations in the hands of the community of beneficiaries.

However, this largesse has begun to shift, and Congress is beginning to ask for better reasons why continued and growing support should be given to higher education. The academy has responded with several different kinds of arguments. They argue that new scientific knowledge is essential for the activities of government itself, and that it provides input for a number of activities which are the responsibility of all other parts of society. They also attempt a cultural justification for government support of science, using such metaphors as "science is the characteristic cultural activity of our civilization, hence should be encouraged." In another argument, which could be called "pyramid-building," science is seen as a moral and economic outlet for the aggressive and accumulative instincts of an industrial society—a moral equivalent of war. Each of these justifications can be challenged. This very fact suggests that there will be a substantial slowing of growth in direct public support of academic science and learning. In the future less money will be given to professors as professors, and more to institutions as institutions, so that they may educate rather than do research. In the last essay the author argues the somewhat questionable thesis that the major universities in America should abandon completely, or as much as possible, the function of undergraduate socialization, leaving this to less prestigious places. Since neither the phrasing nor the thoughts are as felicitous as those of Clark Kerr, this series is not likely to be of major significance, and since the author's few statistics are slightly out of date, the book is not likely to be compelling for students of higher education.

Another weak book is **Bertram Morris'** *Institutions of Intelligence* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1969), a difficult and peculiar volume. The flyleaf suggests that the author's purpose is to redefine the educational needs of a technological age. Hence one is led to expect that his philosophic analysis of the school and society might produce some formulations which could help the practitioner. However, this is certainly not so, although he does use most of the terms which normally appear in discussion of curricular, institutional, and educational reform. Rather, what appears is an exercise in logical reasoning from postulates defined to satisfy the author and the author alone. Now, as an exercise, there can be no quarrel with declaring that "the arts of man are of two sorts; those that perpetuate and those that liberate" and then spinning some deduction from that. But such a phrase is of scant help to a college dean who is struggling to put together a curriculum which will have some theoretical validity and still interest a student body which will enter the institution, for the first time, in three months.

While the author occasionally uses empirical data, as when he sketches the likelihood of increased leisure for man, frequently he does not. This is certainly a weakness, for there is considerable empirical information to suggest that some of the arts or sciences simply don't perform in reality as he suggests they do. Just to illustrate: he says that a freshman who is exposed to a course in natural science can really be expected to develop a deep appreciation of what the new science is. The author has obviously not looked at higher education through the eyes of sociologists or anthropologists, or else he could not say so cavalierly that colleges should not perform the functions of marriage mills, nurseries, or remedial institutes. There is the contrasting point of view which says that the college is indeed a servant of society and performs those functions which the society demands of it. This reviewer may have missed some essential ingredient of the book, for admittedly the language is difficult to follow; but he will continue to seek philosophic assistance elsewhere rather than rely on this contribution of the John Dewey Society.

Not so much bad as angry is **William M. Birenbaum's** *Overlive: Power, Poverty, and the University* (New York: Delacorte Press, 1969), which is long on complaints but short on logical and realistic solutions. In the first chapter Birenbaum inveighs against Overlive, which results from the belief that continuous economic growth is necessary for national survival, as a way of life. He feels that both the Overkill doctrine of defense and the Overlive doctrine of consumption distort human values. But as he moves into the university's specific problems, such as the need to deal with the problems of the central city, to relate to the urban condition, to solve the problems of the ghetto, and to help the poor move into the mainstream of American life, he seems to call for still more of the continuous growth and expansion which he earlier deplores. For example, he would like to see a city campus emerge which would be coincident with the city's major cultural, financial, political, and sociological structures, with great museums becoming the art departments and research centers in banking and financing becoming the economics departments. This seems to further the Overlive mentality, not retard it.

Some of the author's criticisms of higher education, and even some of the ideals he posits for it, are hard to criticize. Thus, he wants diversity and competition to be restored, and he believes that higher education has failed to solve the problems of minority group students. He feels that restrictive admission standards deprive many young people of essential opportunities, but never suggests realistically how reforms can be made. Thus he falters just where John Gardner faltered earlier, in being able to generalize that, for example, there can be many different kinds of excellence, but not specifying what these are in operational terms which can be achieved within the American ethos. When he contends that colleges that are in the urban setting but not of it are really against it, he is in equally good company; but he fails to come to grips with even such mundane questions as how a widespread extension program can be funded, or how a university-based research effort for the city can be supported, as was the land-grant colleges' entry into agricultural research.

Ronald W. Roskens and **Robert I. White** edited *Paradox, Process and Progress* (Richmond: The Kent State University Press, 1968), with the aim of presenting the ideas of outstanding leaders in higher education which could portray authoritatively the contemporary scene. They have generally been successful, for there are essays in this collection that are not readily available anywhere else. Samuel B. Gould shows how the delicate balance between freedom and a university's accountability to its constituents can be maintained. James Perkins points out the dangers to universities of adjudicating more and more of their concerns through judicial due process, but Clark Byce brilliantly refutes this argument and suggests that due process is really consistent with the nature of the university and should not be feared. Logan Wilson suggests that much public criticism is the result of collegiate institutions' failure to put their own houses in order, and warns that unless they do, public scrutiny and tight control are likely to become a reality. In support of this argument, McGeorge Bundy points out that in the past, colleges and universities have not been candid about themselves, their conditions, and their needs, and that quite possibly honesty might, in the long run, be the best policy.

In a way, synthesizing the views of these leaders, Howard Bowen concludes that "The university is currently caught in two dilemmas. On the one hand it is sometimes criticized because it is said to be theoretical and other-worldly, and not to be serving adequately a multitude of immediate purposes as represented by the Pentagon, private business, local government, and so forth. On the other hand, it is criticized because it is said to have sold out to the Establishment. Similarly it is criticized because it serves the prophetic but profoundly upsetting role of an analyst and critic of contemporary society. At the same time it is criticized for being too supportive of existing institutions and policies.

These criticisms are perhaps inherent in the functions of universities. It is simply a fact of life that the university, if it is to be loyal to its mission, will receive criticism. Yet the rationale underlying the traditional independence and freedom of a university is that it should be able to carry out its mission in the face of criticism. This does not mean that it can be unresponsive to the needs of the society it serves, but rather that it retains a substantial degree of self-determination in deciding how it can best serve. Only by being partly ivory tower, by being a center of independent and disinterested thought has the university been able to reach its present position of influence and usefulness; and only by continuing to be partly ivory tower will it be able to sustain and renew itself and thus sustain and renew the society it serves."

Agony and Promise, edited by **G. Kerry Smith** (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969), contains much of the proceedings of the 1969 National Conference on Higher Education; its title refers to a troubled society, troubled campuses, and an uncertain future. The subjects of the essays range from a consideration of the nonrational in an essentially rationalistically oriented world to the pros and cons of faculty unionization to the relevance (or lack of it) of black studies. In contrast to past editions of *Current Issues in Higher Education* (of which this is the latest volume), the papers are consistent in purpose. The Conference had a distinct theme, and contributors were invited because each had something germane to say. This consistency is heightened by connective paragraphs that really weld separately prepared essays into a systematic book.

The theme can be stated briefly: The American university has become politicized. The only serious question remaining is how it will function as a political entity. There is a continuous search for a feeling of community, partly in compensation for an urbanized and impersonalized American society. Much of the agony, of course, derives from the racial crisis and the deterioration of the American city. But the problems of youth and their behavior are also acute, and many are searching to understand student unrest, changing sexual values, and increasing drug use on the campus. As universities try to balance rival claims and desires, the problems of governance become acute, involving not only the distribution of power and responsibility between the two traditional valences, but also the role students should play in this power equation.

There is some feeling that much of the behavior of youth reflects a serious quest for a restoration of nonrational and effective components in a society addicted to rationalism and scientism. Youthful use of drugs, preoccupation with small group experience, and a fancy for heavy beat music may all essentially be a liturgical quest. As to the future, much will depend on whether or not sociopolitical and spiritual shifts in American life can be made.

W. John Minter and **Ian M. Thomson** have edited *Colleges and Universities as Agents of Social Change* (Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1968). This is one more report of a summer conference jointly sponsored by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education and the Western Interstate Commission. Opinions are almost evenly divided between those who support the university's active involvement in social change and those who feel that conditions would be better if institutions remained somewhat aloof from the workaday world. The papers are long on opinion and conceptualization, short on description of actual university involvement or restraint. They are less satisfying than some of those published in earlier conference reports. There is a great deal of mutual quoting of other theorists, which perhaps is a useful bibliographic device but doesn't really advance thought very far.

Leonard A. Lecht has prepared *Manpower Needs for National Goals in the Nineteen Seventies* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1969), which is an attempt to show what the nation's manpower needs are likely to be if we try to achieve 16 major social goals by 1975. These social goals include area redevelopment, extension of higher education to all, improved health services, further exploration of space, and urban development. The report posits that if the nation seriously pursues even a portion of its goals there will be a definite shortage of trained manpower. However, Lecht believes that we can achieve some of the goals completely, and progress reasonably toward all of them, within society's economic resources. He assumes a steady growth in gross national product, and believes that when the war in Vietnam has ended, social policy will bring about a deployment of defense resources into other fields of activity. In the projection part of the book, which seems reasonably optimistic, he tries to show the cost, both in dollars and in people, of achieving all 16 national goals. He does, however, point out the need for priorities, and how emphasizing one goal could cause acute bottlenecks in working toward others. The author did not intend to assist in deciding among priorities, but some suggestions for developing criteria would have been helpful.

An important section of the book deals with educational implications of the achievement of national goals, and here Lecht presents some surprising notions. He clearly believes that what one studies in college is related to what one does as a vocation. This runs somewhat counter to previous estimates. He also seems entranced with the technical potential of junior colleges. One wishes his faith were underscored with a more critical examination of how those institutions actually do perform.

Walter Hirsch has edited *Inventing Education for the Future* (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1967), which brings together seminar papers delivered at the University of California, Los Angeles. It contains a somewhat superficial résumé of methods of making future projections, some polemical demands ("We *must* revive the arts and crafts!"), and a good bit of speculation as to how the computer will really change education. A number of seminar participants seem enamored of systems analysis or the systems approach; but their discussions add little to our understanding of how these theories might operate. Nor do the essays reveal just how primitive adaptation of systems analysis and cost benefit analysis really is. It is difficult to tell what audience the editor had in mind. Among a professional audience, surely a statement such as "The issue of the single salary schedule in education is a controversial one" is not likely to attract much interest or shed much new light on the subject. The essay on resistance to innovation was apparently written without using several empirical studies of innovation on college campuses such as the study of resistance to television at the University of Houston. If fewer seminar collections were published, the literature might be much less cluttered with rather superficial materials.

Basil Fletcher has written *Universities in the Modern World* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, Inc., 1968), a dull, rather pedantic description of institutions founded in developed countries, with some indication of their historic roots and where they are going. His examination of the medieval origins of the university is sound, especially his observation of the early preoccupation with professional education; he points out that medieval universities were really charged with producing needed sorts of people. He understands clearly how contemporary expansion of education up through university level is a product of technological development and increasing national affluence, and sees a strong relationship between higher education's effectiveness and international economics. Higher education expands as professional workers become needed and as a knowledge and theoretical base upon which an economy can be developed is called for. And as higher education expands, it must, of necessity, become increasingly democratic. It must also experiment with newer teaching techniques—and here Fletcher believes the new media are significant.

He clearly relates teaching and research, and arrives at the startling conclusion that "All teaching is the communication of the results of research, so that the only question, and it is a difficult one, is what should be the balance of teaching and research." He does, however, believe that the teachers must be trained in research techniques, and seems quite open to the idea of special programs to acquaint future college teachers with the nature of collegiate pedagogy and of higher education. The author obviously favors long-range planning and, using his English experience, suggests ways of accomplishing it. The book is no better or worse than others that attempt to interpret the university scene through the personal and professional experiences of a wise, thoughtful academician.

Centennial Lectures 1968-1969 (Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 1969) presents a series of addresses delivered during the centennial celebration of Oregon State University. It brings together essays which otherwise would become fugitive documents. These vary enormously in quality and in relevance, ranging from a reminiscing statement by Linus Pauling, which seems to do nothing more than suggest how he developed some of his central scientific ideas, to a serious discussion of world food problems and the contributions which universities have made or can make to solving them. There is a good bit of idealism in most of the essays, but perhaps this is only to be expected from statements made at a celebration. The land-grant idea is valued, although there is general recognition that adapting this idea to new conditions will not be easy.

By far the most significant essay is by Charles Frankel, who in discussing the future rejects both technological determinism and the romantic urge for a simpler life operating through participatory democracy. Frankel realistically faces the facts of technology, large size, and the like, but still believes that many functions could be decentralized and assigned to local government or nongovernmental agencies. While Frankel believes that the phrase "participatory democracy" is a welcome addition to the metaphor of the society, he points out how an essential of freedom is to be able not to participate in a great many things, leaving some tasks to specialists who can do them so much better than the general public. The essay seems to be one more step by Frankel toward a conservative political philosophy.

Dyckman W. Vermilye has edited *Man in Perspective* (Washington: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1969) and should be complimented for bringing four such high-level papers together. The papers were delivered at an annual convention of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, and are presented attractively with a brief introduction by the editor, who points out each paper's significance for counseling and guidance. One paper discusses the evolution of individual human traits; another points out the lessons to be learned from infrahuman species as to the significance of groups. E. G. Williamson, in one of his freshest analyses, discusses human traits that the counselor ought to cultivate. And the last essay points out the more potent theories of personality that should be part of the intellectual background of every counselor.

John Caffrey has edited *The Future Academic Community: Continuity and Change* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1969). These are the papers prepared in advance for the 1968 meeting of the Council, and those presented at that meeting in commentary on the Council's documents. Generally, the Council's papers say what one would normally expect seasoned and experienced participants in recent higher educational history to say. Thus Benezet points out the significance of federal involvement in higher education, the professionalization of the faculty, and the growing impatience of students enrolled in large and impersonal universities. Elliott discusses how past academic structures are probably inappropriate to the major problems which the peoples of the world hope to solve by coming to the universities; his technique for bringing necessary change seems to be to weld some recently evolved democratic practices onto the existing academic structure.

The editor of the volume summarizes what college administrators think is likely to happen in the 1970's. There are few surprises. Most high school graduates will go to college; *in loco parentis* will be less important; there will be more faculty participation in governance; statewide coordinating councils will have more influence; the proportion of students enrolled in private institutions will decline; more funds will go to students as scholarships; formulas will be used to determine levels of federal and state support; more holders of doctorates will go into business, industry, and government; undergraduate curricula will undergo major revisions; and prescribed courses will decline.

Generally, the papers either implicitly or explicity assume a continuing increase in federal support and the need for various sorts of structural and curricular reform. However, the nature of that reform comes through much less clearly than the need for additional funding. Probably the subject of the 1968 Conference made the papers much more speculative than previous Council papers and previous conferences. For, after all, the future is an unknown quantity. As a document indicating both what the educational establishment wants and what it thinks will probably happen, however, the collection is a worthwhile addition. The Council might reexamine the full book at its annual meeting in 1978. The comparisons between anticipation and reality might be revealing.

Edgar Fuller and **Jim B. Pearson** have edited *Education in the States: Nationwide Development Since 1900* (Washington: National Education Association, 1969), a large collection of specially prepared essays describing how state government has involved itself in education throughout national history. Most chapters deal clearly with elementary and secondary education and take up such subjects as the school curriculum and state financing. These portions will be of primary interest to professional educators.

However, one long essay attempts to describe the contribution of state government to higher education. This begins with a rehash of early higher education history, making the usual obeisance to the Morrill Act and the G.I. Bill. The whole tenor of the discussion is that in spite of suspicion on the part of colleges and universities, state departments of education have usually befriended and supported higher education and have even involved themselves deeply in support of academic freedom. But one case of one state superintendent's doing so scarcely establishes this as a predominant historical trend. Since it is prepared by people closely associated with the National Education Association, the chapter fundamentally takes a dim view of public support to private colleges and universities, for fear that such support will trickle into church-related institutions.

The contributions of the Council of Chief State School Officers are presented; it is interesting that this organization takes credit for seeking judicial review on the support to private education provisions of recent legislation, but appears absolutely silent on desegregation. The book beyond doubt has some interesting facts about state involvement and can probably serve as a reference work. However, a genuine interpretation of state government's role in education would require a briefer but more objective and dispassionate treatment.

Lewis B. Mayhew has written *Colleges Today and Tomorrow* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969), in which he presents collegiate institutions as social institutions seeking to respond to society's needs and demands. Generally, American colleges and universities have served the public. However, since World War II demands for service have been great enough to produce not only tension but sometimes open confrontation between institutions and those seeking their services. Much of student protest can be viewed as such a confrontation. In spite of some reluctance, however, colleges and universities have tried to accommodate to changing times, as is revealed by changes in general education, in experimentation with innovation, and even in some attention being paid to teaching.

As to the future, Mayhew sees some developments as being almost inexorable. Large size, statewide systems, increase in graduate work, and the primacy of public higher education will all come about. Whether the curriculum, disadvantaged students, or the urban condition will receive attention is moot. This reviewer believes this to be a fair book, but he is partial.

Warren Bryan Martin has written *Conformity* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969), in which he investigates whether or not the much-lauded diversity in American education indeed exists. And, if he can generalize from some examples, it does not. The author and his associates chose several different types of institutions, some diverging from the norm and others being quite typical of their type. And through questionnaires, site visits, and examination of institutional documents, they sought to discover what people really believed about institutional purposes and change, innovation, and experiment.

Martin finds that although form and organization are diverse, that there is considerable conformity among the schools regarding purposes of education, criteria of excellence, appropriate and inappropriate roles for faculty, administration, and students, and criteria for a satisfactory educational experience. Although this seems to be the central discovery, the author does find some forces within these institutions which might bring about more diversity. There is some curiosity about innovative possibilities, there is the pressure of student protest, and there is evidence that at least in a few places some of the time-honored techniques, such as units of credit, time learning equivalencies, and conventional grades are giving way. But Martin does not show how these factors can operate in the long run against the entrenched professionalism of college faculty members. Finding in the cluster college a potentially important innovation, the author says: "The innovation that provides the most promising opportunity today for administrators interested in promoting institutional change is the cluster college concept whereby small, semi-autonomous colleges can be established within the general framework of the large university, or whereby academic subunits are organized within colleges—the college-within-college idea." And he is probably quite right.

The book has several bothersome features. The author uses created names to preserve institutional anonymity, and yet the actual identities are scarcely concealed. Certainly St. Andrew's College, The University of the Pacific, and The University of California, Santa Cruz, strongly resemble several institutions the author describes. It might have been better just to call the schools by their names. Then, too, the modified case approach used within chapters is redundant enough to bother the reader. But these are minor matters. The book is generally excellent and validates the intrinsic conservatism of college faculties.

Curricular Matters

B. Lamar Johnson in *Islands of Innovation Expanding* (Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1969), elaborates on his earlier survey of innovation in two-year colleges, and expounds on his well-known point of view. He first indicates the major trends in American society, such as proliferation of knowledge, scientific and technological advances, and urbanization, as well as such subsidiary trends as affluence and greater leisure, then shows how these should result in changes in education. He believes that change is required and demanded, not merely change for its own sake but planned change that helps education serve every citizen. With all this in mind, he believes that the uniquely American and relatively young junior college should be a major locale for innovation and change. The junior college will assume responsibility for awarding more bachelor's degrees: it has major responsibility for technical and vocational education; it will be open-door and comprehensive; and it is ideally located to serve more and more student needs.

In this context, he then reports on such innovations as cooperative work-study programs, programmed instruction, the systems approach, and the use of newer media, presenting these by describing what selected junior colleges are doing in these areas. He recognizes, as will the reader, that these innovations have not been thoroughly evaluated. Most of the statements are pure description, and evaluation, when it is attempted, is usually done through obtaining some evidence of student or faculty satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Johnson believes that there should be considerably more evaluation, but does not describe how this assessment could really be funded. He thinks that junior or community colleges are becoming more willing to innovate, and that the future is likely to see a considerably different society for junior college education.

The greatest criticism of the book is that he does not place these innovations which he enthusiastically describes in the context of all other junior college activities. After talking with someone concerned with an innovation, one can assign undue significance to it. This reviewer, for example, studied one of the innovating schools described, and found that while the new idea was interesting, what was going in the rest of the junior colleges was highly orthodox. Johnson's feeling that innovation is expanding may be based on the methods he used in his field work. Nevertheless, the book is a useful compendium and might achieve its goal, which is to encourage others to borrow ideas described.

Another view of innovation appears in **Michael Brick** and **Earl J. McGrath's** *Innovation in the Liberal Arts Colleges* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1969). It reports on an extensive questionnaire study designed to find out which colleges and universities are experimenting with what innovations. The authors have defined an innovation as an idea, thing, or process which is new to higher education, with the newness often stemming from the rearrangement of an accepted procedure. Colleges that responded received follow-up letters asking for detailed descriptions of practices they had indicated on the questionnaire. The results are then described in chapters on such things as new approaches to the curriculum, new instructional methods, and the new position of students on campus.

The findings are not particularly surprising. Interdisciplinary courses seem to be in vogue, and honors programs still attract attention. A number of institutions are experimenting with varieties of freshman seminars and independent study, with the most frequently reported problem being faculty reluctance to put in the time and energy to make them work. The newer teaching techniques receiving the most attention are various forms of hardware, teaching machines, and television, and institutions are trying new physical arrangements such as learning resources centers and residence halls that are used for learning purposes. Quite clearly, students are gaining a new position on campus. They are being given responsibilities for their own private lives and more and more say in academic governance. Other innovations deal with organizing the college, most frequently through some new arrangement of the academic calendar.

As a dictionary of existing innovational practices, the book serves a purpose, like the Johnson book. However, it does not evaluate or criticize, and it seems (although this might be disputed if one were to count the innovations attempted) that the most glowing descriptions come from little-known institutions. The authors should have visited at least a sample of the campuses to see to what extent reality conforms with administrative description.

After some 15 years, **Harold Taylor** once again expresses his basic instrumentalism in a new book, *Students Without Teachers: The Crisis in the University* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969). Taylor believes that the radical students have correctly sensed malfunctionings of not only the educational system but the entire society, and, although they are only a small minority, are in the process of reforming both. Radical youth, having been protected and sustained by permissive parents, have developed the personal freedom necessary to question not only educational practices but also moral issues. This militancy, says Taylor, did not spring full-blown in 1964; it began well back in the 1950's. Although people are inclined to talk of the silent or apathetic generation, actually youth of that time were aware of the serious problems facing society.

The suggestions and demands of militant youth are forcing a reconsideration of the curriculum and styles of teaching. To Taylor these demands underscore the validity of the open or free elective curriculum, and the freedom of professors and students to teach and to study what they will. He feels that the general education movement of the 1950's was fundamentally wrong and debilitating to human development. Obviously, he favors the style of education of Sarah Lawrence, which generally allows a student to take three courses a year completely of her own choosing, decided on after intensive consultation with her don. In many ways, radicalism on the campus has brought educational thinking to a full circle. After some 40 years of development, progressive thought, as enunciated by John Dewey, seems the only way of making higher education significant in society.

The book is difficult to criticize. The sections on radical students reveal Taylor's deep involvement with them, but he may overvalue a number of their activities. His criticism of other writers such as Riesman and Jencks or Kerr seems properly taken, in view of the determinism in their points of view. The most eloquent portions of the book concern the open curriculum, the professor as influence, and the significance of freedom in the human condition. In these sections, Taylor restates his earlier stance that in the 1950's made him one of the most important voices in the country to speak out about education. The chief weakness of the entire program is Taylor's blindness to the organizational problems of large institutions. So many of his illustrations are drawn from Sarah Lawrence, or from a handful of quite small experimental units, that his book really cannot serve as a program for higher education generally. However, as a sermon and as an exposition of the liberal ideal, it is an important document.

One approach to the curriculum is presented by **Lewis B. Mayhew** in *Contemporary College Students and the Curriculum* (Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1969). The author summarizes such recent studies of college students as Joseph Katz's report on Stanford and Berkeley students, Paul Heist's reports on creative college students, and Kenneth Keniston's insights about student radicals. Student demands, expectations, and needs call for a radically different kind of collegiate organization, teaching style, and curriculum. The author suggests a blueprint for developing a new curriculum which would first be divided into general or basic studies, liberalizing studies, contextual studies, and studies in concentration. The sort of experiences all developing humans needed would be specified, as would be the competences which should define collegiate education. The domains of human knowledge and the ways of knowing would also be indicated. This monograph, which is the third in a series, is intended to help college faculties as they are gradually forced to reconsider the curriculum.

At the opposite end of the curriculum style continuum from the Mayhew volume is **Joseph Tussman's** *Experiment at Berkeley* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969). After the student uprisings at Berkeley, the author created an experimental college which has now completed its third year. In this book, Tussman indicates why a new kind of college was needed, and the educational ideas he hoped it could express. He is critical of departmentalism and reliance on a discipline for courses for lower division students. He believes this preoccupation with courses has resulted in a fragmented sort of educational experience, and prefers instead to think of a one- or two-year program. This program would be focused on some idea; students would read and relate to the contemporary conditions and classical documents of several cultural epochs.

Tussman believes in a highly prescribed curriculum, with students deciding only whether to enter the program or not, and one that is based on reading great books or classics. Students would be held to rigorous intellectual demands, regardless of how they interpreted their own needs. The educational program that emerges seems to be a blend of Robert M. Hutchins and Alexander Meiklejohn. The author makes no undue claims for his program's success, and indicates quite candidly the problems he has had in staffing his college. He reserves his enthusiasm for his own ideas and for prescription and serious reading.

Since Tussman's ideas are so contrary to the current trend of advanced thinking about collegiate education, it will be most instructive to watch what happens. A mild prediction is that the experimental college will last only until the author decides to leave Berkeley.

Not so entranced with the beauty of radical youth is **Joseph J. Schwab,** who writes of *College Curriculum and Student Protest* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969). Schwab, a long-time master teacher at the University of Chicago, is quite willing to call militant students sick, some almost incurably; but he believes they are that way in large part because of their education. Students have been misled into believing that they do know what they want, that their tastes are their own concern, that fields of study fall into neat categories, and that youth should have a great deal to say about its own destiny. Colleges have not given students models of mature scholarly behavior; in some schools these models do not exist, in others they are invisible. Then, too, institutions have not forced students to exercise high levels of competency; the students therefore believe that their amateur radicalism enables them to restructure the world.

After making his caustic diagnosis, Schwab derives a series of needs and suggests curricular and instructional ways of meeting them. In a sense, he is doing with a different set of suppositions what Mayhew attempted; but he arrives at a substantially more rationalistic set of curricular prescriptions. Schwab and Tussman seem to have more in common; this is probably understandable, since they both were profoundly influenced by the development of the prescribed curriculum of the College of the University of Chicago in the late 1930's and '40's.

JB Lon Hefferlin, in *Dynamics of Academic Reform* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969), reports on an elaborate study of institutional vitality conducted by the Institute of Higher Education at Teachers College. The author and his associates set out to discover what factors were involved in the adoption of new practices concerned with teaching and the curriculum. They had been impressed with the conservatism of American institutions and the fadism which seemed to characterize the innovation that did occur. They believed that colleges and universities were inherently passive, tended toward institutionalization and ritualism, and enjoyed undeserved reputations. After examining a number of reforms, they discovered that changes generally occurred when the expected rewards for change outweighed the rewards for stability, when there were enough funds and an advocate of reform present with sufficient political power to persuade others. They also observed that change will come about only if the clientele of colleges and universities demand and expect it.

After examining most available documents on institutional reform, studying in detail dramatic cases, and analyzing the results of a questionnaire, Hefferlin finds that there is no single cause for change; rather, there is a series of interesting and interrelated forces that seems conducive to change. Institutions which are struggling for their lives seem more open than do others that have achieved enviable reputations. Those that are open from the standpoint of governance and personal interaction seem more receptive to change than closed systems. It seems generally better if an institution is controlled neither by a patriarchal president nor by an oligarchical faculty.

To one who has long studied innovation, none of the findings are particularly surprising, with the exception of the implication that presidential leadership is not as significant as had been thought. The author concludes that presidential and department head tenure should be limited, for a powerful president too long in office can limit his school's growth. But when one looks at a few dramatic examples of institutions which have changed rapidly over several decades, one is struck by the number of long-term presidents who held office in these schools. President Hanna of Michigan State and President Sterling of Stanford are examples.

Nevertheless, the book is an important contribution. It is well written. The author handles his data well and does take the step, so unusual for educational researchers, of pointing out realistically some practical implications. Perhaps I like the book because so many findings are consistent with points I made earlier in my research monograph, *Innovation in Collegiate Instruction: Strategies for Change.*

One of the most pessimistic books produced in recent times is *Undergraduate Curriculum Trends* by **Paul L. Dressel** and **Frances H. Delisle** (Washington: American Council on Education, 1969). The authors, seeking to determine what curricular changes occurred in American higher education during the critical decade 1957-1967, chose a representative sample of all types of institutions and compared catalogs for each of the benchmark years. They found that graduation requirements, general education offerings, prerequisites, and the fundamental structure of curricula changed very little over the 10-year period. While there were a few changes (a slight increase in foreign language courses) and a few innovations (greater attention to independent study and some interdisciplinary work), during a decade of public criticism of colleges and universities, student protest, turmoil, and collegiate breast-beating, colleges and universities made very few fundamental changes in their curricula.

Such a brief summary really does not do justice to the richness of this 83-page monograph. It presents normative answers to such things as general education requirements, shifts in degrees offered (such as between bachelor of arts and bachelor of science), and changes in requirements for the various major fields of study. The book is of high quality, as are Dressel's other works on the curriculum.

Lawrence Dennis and **Renate M. Jacob** have edited *The Arts in Higher Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968). It is a collection of papers commissioned by the American Association for Higher Education to explore the role of the arts in higher education, and whether or not artistic students are being penalized.

Generally, the writers either set forth conventional wisdom about the potential values of the arts or underscore the lack of widespread serious attention to this field within higher education. Thus one writer contends that the arts are simply another expression of the fundamental value of democracy; both enhance essential humanity. Another argues that the arts ought to be important to all people and consequently to all phases of education. However, the American tradition has been to ignore any connection between the arts and everyday life. Much of the American intellectual tradition is word-oriented, and educators have been skeptical about assigning any significant place to arts education, although what most Americans know of the Greece of Pericles comes from artistic statements. A related pattern of thought is that the arts are nonrational, hence must be feared. If the arts are to take an important place in higher education, their irrationality must be accepted, as well as the fact that they can unleash human creativity but are not to be feared.

Still another writer argues that the arts are clearly in the ascendancy, especially because of the need for creative use of leisure time, and that a cultural explosion is really occurring. Cultural events programs, the existence of artists-in-residence, and more courses in the arts are part of this explosion. But there is obviously room for major improvements in such matters as preparing audiences for the fine arts. In a sense, the college testing movement reflects the same rudimentary approach to the arts that is found in arts programs and curricula. Very few arts aptitude tests have been developed, and those that exist remain under suspicion. Actually, the testing movement, while it does exert some leadership, is rather closely bound to prevailing practice. The basic position paper for this inquiry showed that while some theorists or critics could argue that an artistic or cultural revolution is going on, college and high school curricula, admissions practices, and admissions testing all work to the detriment of the artistically interested or talented student. Even humanities courses are more concerned with verbal descriptions or analyses of artistic statements than with the statements themselves.

Before the arts can take a central place in the curriculum, several important questions must be answered. For example, what difference does it make in the later life of an individual whether he is immersed in the arts or goes through college virtually isolated from them? The papers chart a previously unmapped terrain, so the volume ends with recommendations for next steps. These include a National Commission, continuing seminars for guidance counselors, regional test centers to assess creativity, and the development of new courses, curricula, and instructional materials in the arts, in both secondary schools and colleges and universities.

The Arts and Education (New York: Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation, 1969) is a short booklet bringing together several statements made in seminars dealing with the arts in higher education. Sponsors of seminars assumed that there was an emerging concern for the arts in collegiate institutions, and that that interest should be assessed and new directions charted. The speakers agreed that higher education should be involved in the arts, from training professionals to becoming repositories for artistic materials and dissemination points for various art forms. They also seemed to agree implicitly that studio experience in the arts should be an element of collegiate education, and that this experience could help develop the individual. None of the essays, however, dealt with the fundamental problem which the arts face, which is to show their significance for most people's lives.

Richard Bassett has written *The Open Eye in Learning: The Role of Art in General Education* (Cambridge: The Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1969). It first summarizes the contributions of art education to several levels of education, then suggests how art materials might properly be used. The author is made uneasy by the fact that schools have concentrated on verbal or quantitative thinking and have excluded sight thinking, and that the sciences have displaced the humanities. He cites, for example, President Kennedy's Science Advisory Committee, which when talking of the need for developing leadership referred to doctors, scholars, and engineers but did not mention artists, writers, musicians, or philosophers. He is also worried about how little art education can be obtained at the various levels of schooling.

Once the polemical part of the book is over, Bassett turns to the more technical problems of education. He clearly belongs in the Tyler tradition of curriculum construction: first decide what you want to do, then select the proper materials, and then try to assess whether or not anything is achieved. As the book moves from this abstract notion of curriculum building, it seems to lapse into a plea for more and more art instruction at all levels. Bassett feels that college students need fairly continuous studio experience as well as a good bit of course work in art history.

Perhaps the best and the weakest part of the entire book is the attempt to describe the product of an ideal program of art education. This paragon would see the arts as a mighty language in which some of man's finest thoughts have been expressed; he would recognize the different contributions that reproductions and original works can make; he would seek to own works of art; and he might pursue creative hobbies that were more than spare-time killers. From all this Americans might become more fully humanized toward individuals. The weak part of this section, of course, is the failure to probe the philosophic rationale as to the desirability of some of these outcomes. Except for its reliance on Tyler, the book has no consistent philosophy of education or of aesthetics. It might have been strengthened by more attention to such matters.

A weaker book dealing with substantially the same subject is **Michael Steveni's** *Art and Education* (New York: Atherton Press, 1969). This is written out of an English experience, and minimizes theory, empirical evidence, and philosophy as do so many English works on education. It relies on description of experience and on commonsense applications of experience to new conditions. In a few brief pages the author seeks to expose the nature of education and art, and then to present a brief history of art education in English schools from the early nineteenth century to the present. Biographies of several art education theorists are presented, but they are so brief and so laudatory that they do little more than distort the flow of the art.

Much of the book deals with practical choices, course substance, the equipment of rooms, and possible student projects. Once again, no consisten theory of education or aesthetics is apparent. Nor does the author try to demonstrate what art contributes to human existence. By implication, the author believes in a kind of transfer of training, but never makes explicit how this happens.

An important but nevertheless perplexing book is that edited by **Armstad L. Robinson** *et al., Black Studies at the University: A Symposium* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969). This reports on a conference held at Yale that sought to discover whether or not race was a tenable principle on which to establish a major new curriculum. The conference was convened by the Black Student Alliance, which invited faculty and administrative officers to discuss the whole matter, especially to hear the BSA's rationale for a black studies program.

The publication explains, in reasonably articulate form, the black intellectuals' search for some style of life which blacks can adopt with dignity and still function alongside of a majority white community. Most of the black speakers emphasized black separatism and black nationalism in the face of what they regarded as an all-pervasive national racism. In an effort to move toward these goals, they wanted a new curriculum resting on nonwhite presuppositions and using a nonwhite rationale and logic. At this point the book begins to perplex the reader; the white participants also appeared perplexed as they tried to understand how a black sociology or historiography would differ from the way those disciplines are currently taught, if courses were to include all the necessary facts.

The white participants did not really question the conclusions of studies of the black community in the United States or the historical contributions of blacks in American history, African languages or African geography, communities, or history. Rather, the verbal struggle was to find a philosophic, or perhaps just linguistic, set of presuppositions upon which such subjects could be built which would be acceptable to both the whole academic community and its black portion. The most helpful essay in this regard was a paper by Robert F. Thompson on "African Influence on the Arts of the United States," which did purport to show the strong and pervasive influence of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century African culture on artistic statements of Negroes in the United States in the eighteenth and twentieth centuries.

There are still too few black scholars in the United States to staff all institutions undertaking comprehensive programs of black studies. This fact seemed to concern the white participants more than the blacks, who argued that a crash program using existing personnel could rapidly produce an enlarged cadre of trained black scholars. Institutions seriously considering offering black studies should find the outline of the proposed program at Yale instructive, for it was carefully thought out and the needs of the University and of the black students seemingly accommodated. Normally, symposium reports are virtually unreadable. This one is a happy exception for which the editors are entitled to high praise.

The Mathematical Sciences (Cambridge: The Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1969) is an extraordinarily important contribution to public and professional understanding of the intellectual community. It consists of a series of short essays, written for the most part by mathematicians, that suggest the interrelationships between mathematics and a variety of other human concerns. While the essays deal with complex mathematical concepts, most do so in terms that the nonmathematician can handle. And the authors have frequently used a fresh adaptation of mathematics rather than one so frequently cited. Thus, the essay on the social sciences suggests how linear programming, the theory of gains, and graph theory now serve all social sciences, rather than the more general application of statistics to the social science. Not that statistics has been overlooked, for there is a long essay on statistical inference, and there are several dealing with probability and with the uses of the computer for simulation planning.

The book was created as a supporting document for a long report assessing the present status and future needs of the mathematical sciences, but the essays should also be useful to the nonmathematician and the nonscientist who do need to appreciate the direct implications of even the most abstract of mathematical inventions.

Lewis S. Feuer, in *The Conflict of Generations* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1969), presents an elaborate psychohistorical study of student activism in various societies, from the earliest in Germany in 1812-14 to U.S. student revolts in 1968. The author finds some common themes in all of these. Student revolt represents a clear rejection of legitimacy of the society's adult leadership. Revolts, by and large, are conducted by upper middle class youth who have had a reasonably comfortable existence. While revolting students have claimed to be allied with laboring groups, the rapprochement has generally not been accomplished, for students are really seeking to impose their own elite rule to replace the elite rule in existence. In Germany, Russia, France, the United States, for over a century and a half, revolting students have stressed romanticism, return to the soil, feeling and emotion instead of rationalism, and a preoccupation with death and suicide.

Most student protest movements have in the end strengthened conservative or reactionary forces. Illustrative are the student protests in Germany during the late Napoleonic period, which so disturbed the ruling classes in the German states that a strong movement toward constitutionalism was defeated, thus paving the way for Germany's eventual Prussianization. Student protests in the 1880's and '90's in Russia culminated in the assassination of Czar Alexander II just on the eve of a constitutional movement. The reaction destroyed any hope for constitutionalism and paved the way for severe repression, which then led to the 1917 Revolution. In Bosnia, it was student revolutionaries who planned and carried out the assassination of the Archduke of Austria, which sparked World War I. The disturbing thing is that students in the United States in the late 1960's used substantially the same idiom and seemed to accept the same sorts of beliefs as these earlier students.

Feuer has reviewed an enormous amount of material in preparing for this book. However, he may have overlooked some relevant empirical studies. Thus he claims that suicide is an important preoccupation of students, while Kenneth Keniston, through clinical studies, suggests that protesting students are far from suicidal and are indeed in better mental health than nonprotesting students. And his concept of a serious Oedipal conflict is also denied by the good relationship radical students seem to have had with their fathers, according to other studies. Feuer clearly opposes much of the protest activity on American college campuses, and occasionally he argues his case too diligently. Nonetheless, this is an important work that anyone attempting to understand college campuses in 1969 must read.

In opposition stands **Immanuel Wallerstein,** who in *University in Turmoil: The Politics of Change* (New York: Atheneum Publishers, 1969), which owes its inception to the incidents at Columbia, attempts to examine abstractly the crises of the universities all over the world. As an exercise in abstract theory, the book is almost a *tour de force.* Wallerstein's idea of the university is a group of scholars who have come together to work together, with apprentices who are pursuing the profession of learning. The university asserts that its ideas are universal, but this is always a distorted claim because the university exists within a particular society, hence may frequently contradict other societal values. By nature, then, the university must always exist with considerable tension, which will increase as the significance of the university within the society is generally recognized. Out of this tension come three distinct questions, whose answers comprise the body of the book. Should the university serve the national interests? Should the university concern itself with oppressed groups within the society? And how may the university itself best be governed?

The author argues that whether the university wishes to be or not, it is a political agent; and since either its support of or its indifference to government is a political act, the university is engaged in politics. Until quite recently, institutions acted as though it were natural to support government when government requested that assistance. However, that assumption began to be seriously questioned when the United States and Russia began a rapproachement which suggested that we really did not believe international Communism was all that bad. After this was recognized, any justification for the war in Vietnam was dissipated and the action of the government shown to be naked imperialism. The sudden loss in credibility for the previously normal desire to support government led to the major attacks through the university at the nation's defense posture.

The universities have traditionally prepared high-level workers, operating without conscious regard for their physical surroundings. Now, however, the location of universities in urban areas, expanding land, buildings and enrollment have contributed to an imbalance in urban ecology. Universities that continue their laissez-faire policies will help downgrade those who live in ghetto areas. Since the university has contributed to the problems of the poor, it should become an active agent in improving the ecology in channeling the poor into higher vocations and callings. As for governance of colleges, the author is convinced that the more democratic and participatory governance is, the less will be the likelihood of violence. The purest sort of democratic institution could not have any violence. Thus, as an ideal he posits that faculty and students assume complete control and accomplish needed administrative tasks as temporary, *ad hoc* administrators.

The book does make a remarkable theoretical contribution. It also might be considered, in part at least, Wallerstein's psychoanalytic autobiographical statement. One wonders which intellectuals he is talking about when he says, "Their desire to stay on such good terms with the government was made more urgent by the collective social guilt many of them exhibited, especially in the early days of the cold war, about the previous collaboration of some liberal intellectuals with Communists." The book also reveals that the author has not observed overcritically European universities, which he praises for letting faculty themselves appoint chief administrators. The syndicalism of European universities has, for the most part, kept them unresponsive to society's needs. In England, for example, the University Grants Committee has had to become more and more regulatory just to force faculties away from syndicalism. And Raymond Aron's analysis of French universities (see p. 27-28) does not support the virtues of extreme syndicalism either.

James McEvoy and **Abraham Miller** have edited *Black Power and*

Student Rebellion (Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1969) and have provided an important resource on recent student protests. While the collection does not go far beyond labels and polemics, it does provide as objective descriptions and statements of position as are currently available. The book is divided into three portions: case descriptions of a number of places where sit-ins or other forms of protest have developed, a presentation of protagonists' points of view, and a series of essays seeking to probe the root causes of student dissent. The descriptions of such places as Stanford, San Francisco State, and Columbia describe what actually happened without imputing particular motives or intentions to the actors. Quite obviously, the militant student or his faculty supporter will find these case studies biased in favor of the Establishment; but to most others they will appear quite calm and judicious.

No one, however, can accuse the protagonists' essays of objectivity, ranging as they do from the quasiliterate ravings of Max Rafferty, who sees a conspiracy around every corner, to the emotional yearnings and pleadings of Nathan Hare for black separatism. Even when spokesmen attempt to be objective, as do Bill Barlow and Peter Shapiro as they describe San Francisco State, they produce a polemic. Thus they see the administration's response as being both frantic and equivocal and Hayakawa as being the executor of Reagan's hard-line strategy.

The third section is by far the most objective, containing such thoughtful interpretations as those of Kenneth Keniston. The editors deliberately avoided preparing transitionary essays, and this was probably a mistake. But even the somewhat unfocused effect of the various essays is a highly significant contribution. One hopes the book will be widely bought and used.

Another collection, edited by **David Martin,** is *Anarchy and Culture: The Problem of the Contemporary University* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969). Prepared in a different context, this book examines problems of university and student confrontation in the United Kingdom. The volume's broad philosophic context is prepared by the editor, who compares professors to earlier monks in monasteries who eventually cut themselves off from the mainstream of human existence, and in a way set the stage for the Protestant Reformation. Indeed, some amazingly pointed comparisons can be made between the present storm and stress on college campuses and the Reformation. Protestant belief in faith alone struck at the heart of monastic discipline and scholasticism, just as radical subjectivity strikes at the heart of academic disciplines. And the author sheds insight on the origins of protesting students by his remark that most reformers are like Martin Luther, ex-monks who strive not only to reform but also to destroy the very institutions that created them. Protestant reformers stood for the priesthood of all believers, and modern protesters stand for participatory democracy for all.

This revolutionary outburst, however, also has demographic roots. The explosion of college enrollments in England diluted the homogeneity of university students and provided the explosive chemistry and the frustrations which could give rise to militancy. Just as increased heterogeneity among British students caused conflict, so the influence of new kinds of people entering the professoriat has destroyed an older hierarchy and made possible strident faculty demands. The very fact that younger faculty members with lower prestige are now in the majority of English institutions is significant. Virtually all of the essays recognize the profound changes that have shaken English higher education, and indicate a desire to accommodate to them. There is a minimum of nostalgic longing for the more tranquil past; rather, there is a musing wondering whether some of the older practices, such as collegial concern for character-building, could somehow be simulated in newer conditions.

In the past, this reviewer has sharply criticized syndicalism among British university faculties. This book suggests that at least among some of them worship of syndicalism is disappearing, and probably this is true, since only several of the writers hold appointment at the Oxbridge institutions.

Still another anthology, edited by **Louis C. Vaccaro** and **James T. Covert,** is *Student Freedom in American Higher Education* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1969). This is a somewhat more eclectic series of presentations, with some being thoughtful searches for root causes and a few being overemotional pleas for one solution or another. The essays generally are based on the notion that student activism in the 1960's differs in both quality and quantity from that of other periods.

Edward Blackman's essay is slightly bittersweet but does pull together coherently most of the major interpretive statements about students, their protests, and their problems. Blackman reveals some antagonism toward the more militant students in such statements as "There are at long last some calm and wise voices being raised in response to the cacophony of half-educated juveniles who have recently discovered that the world is not perfect, who somehow believe that their parents are responsible for all the accumulated ills of mankind, who believe that in extirpating evil one may employ any means, including harming people, holding hostages, seizing buildings, copying secret files, and even overthrowing the Establishment [whatever that is]." He feels that white students who use violence and plan revolution lack any shred of moral justification.

Somewhat more accepting of the student litany is Vaccaro, one of the two editors, who perceives a new mood among today's young people who have cast off, once and for all, the adult ethic and the adult point of view. Students are manifesting this rejection of adult practices, many of which are open to criticism. Since student protest does have some validity, some reform of higher education can be anticipated as a result.

But not all the authors accept student claims at face value. One points out that many students discuss student freedom in complete ignorance of the history of higher education, the nature of the university, and the university's role in society. And another writer feels that student demands for greater participation in academic governance are likely to taper off fairly soon. One graduate student attempts to compare and contrast the life style of Berkeley with the life style of smaller liberal arts colleges; the essay would have been considerably better had the author been more aware of the real nature of liberal arts institutions. Other essays deal with the necessity for due process within higher education and the leading role of research institutions in creating and maintaining academic freedom. The book is a good resource for present understanding and for what must come one day, a definitive account of student protests in the 1960's.

And still another anthology on the same subject is *Confrontation: The*

Student Rebellion at the Universities, edited by **Daniel Bell** and **Irving Kristol** (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1969). This edited volume presents moderate or even conservative essays on the nature and significance of student protests. Berkeley was a prime example of a student rebellion that occurred among privileged students with an assured future. The University was standing in for the world and its problems, while radical students demanded that the University provide refuge, then stand as a surrogate for society, and eventually participate in restructuring the nation.

At San Francisco State a crisis broke out over issues which were well along the road toward resolution, and was brought on partly because of the administrative mistake of employing a black studies leader who had a record of emotional militancy. The administration's mistake was in not discovering this easily verifiable fact.

At Columbia, none of the events which allegedly precipitated the outbreak were significant. Indeed, there had been general approval of the building of the gymnasium. Columbia, rather than rejecting progress, was well along the way toward anticipating new needs and demands when radical students decided to precipitate a crisis. The free market seems to have the most validity for ultimately resolving campus protest. If public support for education could go directly to students, these students then would have the only kind of power that really counts, the freedom to purchase the kind of education they want on terms acceptable to them. Since so many anthologies about students since 1964 have consisted of quite emotional apologies for the generations of the 1960's the sane candor of these essays is indeed refreshing.

Donald L. Rogan has written *Campus Apocalypse* (New York: Seabury Press, 1969). He sees student questing as being essentially religious. He discards the generation gap model, the psychotherapeutic model, and the games model (revolution for the hell of it) as not being comprehensive enough to explain student unrest. Rather, he feels that students are seriously questing for salvation—a salvation which other generations of young have sought in sex, and before that in formal religion. Drugs are appealing as a means of bringing people into touch with the cosmos, as are Oriental and transcendental religions. The closeness which people believe they can find through sensitivity training approximates the closeness of early Christian communities, and fundamentally small group experience seems motivated as were earlier martyrs in their search for salvation. Even in activism and revolution students seem to be attempting to perform a redemptive act; and while much of their behavior is questionable, their goals are fundamentally to transform the texture and quality of life. Even (or perhaps especially) the students' demands for educational relevance are demands for courses which will lead to self-understanding and eventually salvation.

This is an important book for it argues seriously one point of view which sociologists and psychologists have not explained, yet which might be the most valid of all.

In a brilliant, somewhat comparative study, **Raymond Aron** examines the nature of student protest in *The Elusive Revolution: Anatomy of a Student Revolt* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1969). The author, a French professor and journalist, analyzes the recent events during which French college students almost wrecked the French economy and government. He wrote the book in part as an apologist for his own criticism of the French revolutionary tactics, and in doing so sheds light on student protest activities elsewhere.

The French student outbreak derived partially from factors common to all student revolts: a reaction to extravagant institutional growth, the enrollment of a generation of students who had known neither war nor an immediate postwar period, and generally overcrowded conditions in institutions which were not organized to react creatively to demands for change. However, this revolt went further because it transpired in a society where there are only two political forces—the Communist Party and the Republic. Thus the revolt developed quickly because of the support of Communists, but ended just as quickly as a result of a speech by the President, since French political leaders recognize that to give in to revolution means to adopt Communism, which the bulk of the people are unprepared to do. In retrospect the French treated the student problem just about as clumsily as did American leadership. Authorities hesitated between letting lawlessness continue or using external force, and this made the task of the revolutionaries easier. Professors who in their lectures had advocated a leftist position suddenly found themselves face to face with the practical implications, and didn't know how to respond. In general, the university's hierarchical organization was too rigid to respond, and of course there was the significant generation gap. In spite of participants' feelings that the student revolt was a historical event, it turns out to have been an absurd episode, as is shown by its rapid end.

Aron's book is the French equivalent of a growing number of conservative analyses of student protest in the United States. As a literary document, however, it is far superior to most produced here. It is a shame that more American writers about educational matters cannot develop the elegance of style of this insightful essay.

James Simon Kunen wrote *The Strawberry Statement* (New York: Random House, Inc., 1968), which is fine for him but difficult for the reviewer. It is a diary-type résumé of the Columbia student protests in 1968, and the activities and feelings of several individuals who participated in that series of events. The author took part, was arrested, and apparently believed in a number of things the protesters wanted, yet observes both the events and himself with considerable wry humor and skepticism. For example, he took part in the building occupation activities during their height, but would also leave periodically to practice with the crew and even to travel to Boston for an imporant race. Illustrative of the tone throughout the book is this paragraph:

> Everyone is organizing now, moderates, independent radicals, liberated artists, librarians, and the Yippies are suing universities for evicting us from our .homes which we owned by virtual squatters' rights. You can hardly move for the leaflets here, except at Barnard. The Barnard girls are typing their papers and getting ready to go to Yale for the weekend. We are on strike, of course. There are liberation classes, but the scene is essentially no more pencils, no more books.

After so much highly serious, humorless rhetoric by the young, *The Strawberry Statement* is indeed refreshing. The author contends that the Columbia action cannot be dismissed as an overgrown panty raid or as a manifestation of the vernal urge. However by putting those events in youthful perspective, he shows that they were no apocalypse either. He recognizes, and feels deeply, that things are wrong with the United States, but is willing to give American democracy one more chance. Aside from this, the author does have a sure feel for language which one can predict he will demonstrate more in the future.

Barbara and **John Ehrenreich** have written *Long March, Short Spring: A Modern Reader* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1969), which purports to describe student uprisings at home and abroad and is dedicated to the Vietnamese people. They argue that 1968 was the year of the revolutionary student, when across the world students were demonstrating the tragic failures of their societies. In Germany a glittering postwar economy proved to be tinsel, and in most Western nations coercive war in areas previously held as colonies revealed the ugly and vindictive side of capitalism. Country by country, the authors try to describe why students behave as they do. They generalize that the universities of the Western world have come to be detention camps or recreation areas for people who, in the best years of their lives, are really not wanted or needed by the total society. Finally discovering just how exploited students were, these students began a major cultural revolt which won't be stemmed "until our most fantastic demands are met, fancy will be at war with society. . . . We are full of optimism; we are the future."

Michael A. Baker *et al.* have written *The Police on the Campus* (New York: New York Civil Liberties Union, 1969), an in-depth examination of alleged police brutality during the Columbia uprisings. The report, which focuses on police violence, is based on interviews with people who were involved. The authors believe that greater respect for police is essential but can come only after the real truth about police brutality has come to light. They admit that they are not completely neutral on the subject.

What unfolds is episode after episode of police use of greater force than the situation warranted; they conclude that police often used violent tactics without first trying other means to accomplish their ends, and often failed to give clear, audible instructions or otherwise make their intentions known before resorting to violence. The police failed to wear identification badges, and higher police officers were frequently present as supervisors while lower officers were openly using violence and unnecessary force. The police were inconsistent in their use of force, using too much in some places and none in others:

> The extent of police violence at Columbia cannot be explained solely as a response to provocation. It is clear that on April 30 there was very little provocation of any kind on the part of the demonstrators, faculty members or bystanders. On May 22, violence on the part of the police was far out of proportion to the verbal and physical provocation on the part of students and others. This conclusion is in agreement with the impressions of the Cox Commission. It is also clear that at several points the violent reaction of the police to some real threat occurred after the threat had passed, and thus could hardly be defined as defensive.

The authors generally conclude that the frequently advanced notion that police violence was a result of a few bad apples is not true. What emerges is widespread systematic and deliberate use of violence by the police.

As a historical document this report will undoubtedly be of value. The authors tried to obtain reports from participants and others, so to the extent that those reports presented were assimilated, this is probably a reasonable, panoramic view of what happened. The authors did try to obtain similar information from the police, but were denied access to it. Since the report focuses on the events of only a few days, it may be as deceiving as examining in detail a regimental attack without looking at the broader divisional corps of army strategy. For an understanding of the emotional climate on the Columbia campus which could give rise to such violence, the whole series of events, including examples of obscenity committed against officials of the university, would have to be chronicled and interpreted. Spitting in the face of a dean one day obviously does not cause a mood of violence the next, but certainly must have contributed something. The book is well edited and highly readable.

William A. Westley and **Nathan B. Epstein,** in *Silent Majority* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.), have presented a study of college students and their families which attempts to find correlates of students' emotional health. Using psychometric and psychiatric techniques, the authors derived and tested hypotheses by comparing the families of emotionally healthy and emotionally disturbed students.

The book establishes that the relationship between parents is critical to children's emotional development. Where the mother married above herself in the socioeconomic scale, the parents tended to be emotionally healthy and to have satisfying emotional and sexual relations; where she married below herself, the reverse was true. Thus status is a powerful influence even within the family. Where both mothers and fathers accepted definite roles that involved considerable sharing of work within the home, there was usually good emotional health among parents and children. Family leadership can be father-dominant, father-led, egalitarian, or mother-dominant; the father-led type produced the largest proportion of emotionally healthy children. Mothers and fathers who accepted their sex roles helped bring about good emotional health. If fathers sometimes took care of female babies and mothers cared for male babies, children were helped to accept their own sex roles, and this acceptance went along with emotional health. Father-led families that tried to solve problems seem to produce healthier children than did those that let themselves be inundated with problems.

The study seems to be carefully done, grounded in a consistent theory, with its conclusions supported by the data. The findings are so amazingly consistent with contemporary theories of emotional health that they appear almost pat. However, assuming that the conclusions do reveal actual phenomena, the book should be of considerable interest, not only to student personnel people but to admissions officers, professors, and indeed to all of higher education. Amazingly, the book is reasonably clearly written and the authors have denied themselves the luxury of preoccupation with jargon.

Alexander W. Astin and **Robert J. Panos** have prepared *The Educational and Vocational Development of College Students* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1968) which is a follow-up study of some 36,000 students four years after their matriculation. This large longitudinal study attempts to test some previously developed hypotheses about the impact of various sorts of colleges on students. As one of its unique features, there is a serious attempt to develop elaborate information about student input, student output, and environmental variables characteristic of various colleges. Using large numbers and refined statistical techniques, the authors have sought to put together a model for research and a national resource of data.

The most significant finding is that a student's intellectual achievement, as measured by the Graduate Record Examination at the end of four years, depends much more on his characteristics and plans at the time of matriculation than on his choice of undergraduate institution. This calls into question the old discriminations made between schools on the basis of academic excellence. Graduates seem reasonbly well satisfied with their colleges, which is a finding somewhat at variance with those of other studies.

No other particular surprises are presented. Engineering and the sciences don't seem to be holding students as well as they might. Students involved in research as undergraduates continue in their professional lives. Undergraduate marriage does seem to hasten dropping out of school, there is generally more dropping out in public institutions than in private institutions, and scholarship awards seem to lessen dropout rates. Although the findings are not surprising, it is good to have the solid empirical base for what many have long suspected.

Kathleen R. Mock and **George Yonge** have written *Students' Intellectual Attitudes, Aptitudes and Persistence* (Berkeley: Center for Research and Development of Higher Education, 1969). This is a study of dropouts at three branches of the University of California for the first two years after their matriculation, and an attempt to find attitudinal personality or aptitude correlates of dropout patterns. The book suggests that poor students drop out more often than better students, but not in any extreme sense. The total dropout rate during the first two years is approximately 40 percent, with some slight differences between campuses. The authors had started the study believing that the most intellectually-oriented students might tend to drop out at disproportionately higher rates, but this notion was not completely confirmed. The intellectually-oriented students who left did seem to pursue a more intellectual life style than did their counterparts who remained in the university; this squares with the press-reported tendency for nonstudents in Berkeley to read more widely than University students.

Lee Cogan wrote *Negroes for Medicine* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1968) as a summary of the discussion held at the Macy Conference on the problems of bringing more Negroes into the practice of medicine. The book begins with the many criticisms that can currently be made, ranging from complaints about the culturally impoverished backgrounds of so many Negro college students to the unfairness of culture-bound tests used to select medical students. The problems of predominantly Negro schools are well described as are the difficulties of students from these institutions who enter predominantly white medical schools. Then follows a résumé of steps that have been taken to rectify this. These range from making early small grants to the two predominantly Negro medical schools to creating health centers to attempting to upgrade Negro undergraduate education, either by sending teaching interns into Negro institutions or by giving students an extra year at highly selective, predominantly white liberal arts colleges.

What can still be done? Suggestions include improving teaching in predominantly Negro colleges, providing greater financial support for both undergraduates and medical students, paying greater attention to advising first-year college students and high school students about the opportunities in medicine, and helping to socialize Negroes in dominantly white medical schools. Long-range solutions will, of course, require enormous expenditure of funds and great flexibility in planning and implementing medical curricula. Changes must begin in the lower grades and in secondary schools.

The book represents an interesting style of conference reporting, which seems preferable to reproducing transcripts of actual discussions. One feels that the author attempted to capture the essence of what each of a number of thoughtful people had to say, and succeeded. The only principal weakness of the method is that the structure comes from the flow of discussion rather than from the mind of the writer.

Governance, Organization, and Administration

The 1964 crisis at the University of California at Berkeley has spawned a number of things, some quite destructive and others quite creative. **Cabel Foote, Henry Mayer,** and associates, serving as a committee appointed by the Berkeley Senate and the Associated Students of the University of California, have produced an important study of governance now released in book form. *The Culture of the University, Governance and Education* (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968) advances two principal theses regarding campus governance.

The first, supported by a majority of the committee, is that conditions at Berkeley are bad; the University's faults include coldness, impersonality, lack of community, and failure of education, especially in the lower division years. Departmentalism, high specialization of the faculty, and hierarchical administrative arrangement are all found to impede human development. To rectify these conditions, the majority favor decentralizing in new and untried ways. Increased communication, open discussion of all University problems, and a high degree of student and faculty participation are also suggested. The majority of the committee seems almost willing to exclude central administration from direct power; it assigns to the Chancellor the role of Chief of State and not much more. Specific recommendations included the creation of new undergraduate colleges having their own faculties, the creation of a new committee system with a revised Senate appointing the membership, and the use of students to make policy in all levels of government. The second thesis held by a minority of the committee is that the Chancellor's powers should be increased, that the present system of committees seems adequate, and that while students should be heard, there was no need to involve them so thoroughly in the governance of an essentially professional enterprise.

The authors of the majority report recognize that their document might be considered Utopian, and it probably is. For example, they seldom come to grips with such matters as how to fund or staff lower division colleges in a university which assigns the greatest rewards to the research and publication efforts of faculty members. This Utopianism, however, is not a major weakness. While the solutions the majority and minority suggest could not be adopted by other institutions, the document nevertheless raises most of the issues involving governance which all institutions must face, and does stand as a model of how they can be examined. The publisher is to be congratulated for having made available as a book a document which previously existed only in a scarcely legible newsprint format.

A book of potential significance for higher education, although its focus is on elementary and secondary education, is **Steven Cole's** *The Unionization of Teachers* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1969).

This is a well-written and well-revised doctoral dissertation on how the trade union movement developed in the New York public schools to the point where union members could with impunity strike and gain significant economic benefits.

The author set about discovering why, after generations of trade unionism, teachers during a time of relative general affluence adopted the techniques of collective bargaining, salary check-off, and the strike. During the Depression, teachers did not unionize simply because there were so many well-prepared teachers waiting to take their jobs if they struck, and because faculty salaries were among the highest middle-class Americans could earn. However, by the late 1950's the relative earnings of public school teachers had declined and they felt themselves at a disadvantage. Here the principle of relative deprivation seemed to operate.

It is significant that the initial impetus toward trade unionism came in the junior high school, whose teachers in many respects had no clear reference group with which to identify. Both elementary and high school teachers were clear identities understood by the general public, but the junior high school teacher was not; hence role dissatisfaction developed most acutely in these schools. This factor has considerable significance for higher education, for the junior high school and the junior college are comparable in many respects and each may become the locus for an emerging trade unionism. Younger teachers, teachers from liberal homes, Jewish teachers, and teachers who were professionally committed to a lifetime of teaching were the most susceptible to unionism.

The effort to unionize would not have succeeded had the Board of Education been even slightly responsive to what were clearly impossible conditions. Only when the Board appeared completely unyielding did a group of evening school teachers call a strike to raise what was scarcely a living wage. From that point on, the New York story is the story of other successful protest activities throughout the country: administration vacillation, administrative reaction with too little, and finally administrative capitulation in the face of powerful teacher pressures.

Beyond doubt the book should be mandatory reading for administrators and trustees across the country. As one who is somewhat against unionization of teachers, I am not sure I would recommend the book for militant teachers. It could be used as an effective handbook.

An amazingly well-written book, considering that it is the product of a committee, is *Five College Cooperation: Report of the Five College Long-Range Planning Committee, 1969* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1969). This is the result of thoughtful deliberations of representatives of Amherst, the University of New Hampshire, Mount Holyoke, Smith, and the University of Massachusetts about how these five institutions might best cooperate.

From the beginning, the committee rejected the idea of merger, believing there were values in each institution's stressing certain indigenous matters. They also rejected a return to absolute institutional autonomy, but tried to discover ways in which institutional self-interest could be best served through cooperative activities. They believed that all academic consortia should strengthen educational offerings by more effectively allocating and conserving limited money, staff, and facilities. And the committee examines virtually every possibility for cooperation.

Since the report is so comprehensive, no quick summary is possible. But generally, the educators seek to find what they call "academic complementarity" and ways of testing proposed cooperative projects against that criterion. While they want each institution to retain its distinctiveness, they are quite ready to have each one practice some self-denial. It is doubtful whether any other joint faculty committee operating anywhere else in the country could produce a more comprehensive analysis of cooperative possibilities. As such, for at least the next five years, this book should be helpful to the five institutions sponsoring it, and definitive to the rest of the country.

Ellis L. Phillips, Jr. has written *A New Approach to Academic Administration* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1969). After making a case for improved college administration, he describes in detail the origin and conduct of the Phillips Foundation Program of Internships in Academic Administration. This program was conducted for three or four years before it was absorbed by the American Council on Education. It demonstrated that a relatively small foundation could do something significant, and that a year of experiences for incipient or prospective administrators could have a perceivable payoff. As a chronicle of the progression of an innovative idea, this small book is worthwhile, for careful examination of these sorts of activities will produce some ultimate theory about the training of administrators.

Humphrey Dohrman has rendered an enormous service in writing *Cross Currents in Collective Admissions* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1968). This book attempts to show private institutions the truly limited market for their services. Increasingly, private institutions are seeking more and more academically qualified students and, hopefully, those who can pay the necessary steadily increasing tuition.

After examining several cases of institutions using their own admissions policies, Dohrman demonstrates how few people were available to them for an entering freshman class. To illustrate, let us assume that a college wants only students who score 500 or more on the SAT. Fifteen percent of high school seniors are likely to score this well or better. So of a million high school graduates, only 150,000 are intelligent enough. Then let us assume that the institution must rely on tuition to maintain its services, and requires a family income of over $16,000 a year to support a child in the school. Possibly 12 percent of the nation's families are so situated. This yields about 18,000 to 20,000 students in the real pool from which private, increasingly selective, and increasingly high-cost institutions must recruit their student bodies.

Refinements can, of course, be made in this market approach to the admissions problem, but the essence of the technique is clear. The implications are that with the exception of a limited number of well-endowed, highly selective institutions that can support capable students who lack adequate financial backing, most private institutions must anticipate accepting students who can pay—but whose SAT or ACT scores are lower than 500. This book is simply required reading for the presidents, admissions directors, and faculty members of private institutions.

William C. Greenough and **Francis P. King** have written *Benefit Plans in American Colleges* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969). It describes the evolution of benefit plans, from Andrew Carnegie's provision for retirement plans to be administered by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to the most recent health and long-term disability income plans. The book deals only with four major staff benefit areas: retirement benefits, survivor benefits, illness or injury benefits, and income benefits during disability. Hence, such perhaps equally important fringe benefits as educational benefits for children, provision of mortgage funds, and leasing of homes are not considered. However, within the four areas the analysis and description are most helpful, since the generalizations are based on a 19-page questionnaire sent to all four-year degree-granting institutions.

The book's principal weakness is that it is purely descriptive and makes no attempt to assess critically the various plans. While evaluative comment might have been somewhat dangerous, it might have helped the concerned president or trustee considering extension of benefits. Since the authors concentrated on plans in American colleges, they did not mention plans offered by the various professional and learned societies. A truly comprehensive résumé of the field should include such plans. Indexes tabulate the provisions of all responding institutions in each of these benefit areas. However, since the field is expanding so rapidly, those tabulations should be used cautiously.

The book was probably worth doing and adds something to the two works by Mark Ingraham, but whether or not it is worth $15 is somewhat conjectural.

Walter P. Medsker *et al.* have edited *Dimensions of Academic Freedom* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1969), a collection of papers delivered at the College of Law of the University of Illinois that codifies existing thinking on a number of issues. Medsker himself argues that the AAUP's stance on academic freedom is almost obsolete, for it deals with factors which were relevant in the early part of the century while conditions have changed. He feels that the delocalization of institutions presents a whole host of questions, such as the relationship of professors to state and national government, that were just not considered in the earlier statement. Sanford Kadish argues that the strike is inappropriate for college teachers, since it really violates the service ideal that ought to characterize a professor. He admits that professors do need to protect their economic status, but he feels that the strike, for either economic gains or political reasons, penalizes the wrong people or agencies. By far the most syndicalist author is Arthur D. Bardeleben, who would provide the professor, under the guise of academic freedom, with freedom to speak as a professional person on every conceivable subject. His statement that "the faculty must exercise and insist upon its right and duty to exercise academic freedom without any qualification whatever" may be Utopianly desirable but unrealistic.

The last essay sees a clear breakdown of the previous paternalism of the American college without any new system of relationships replacing it. It is this failure to invent new institutions that lies at the heart of student protests in the 1960's. The author somewhat deterministically argues that "revolutions call forth leaders, leaders never call for revolutions." He feels that both student activists and constituted authorities have made several mistakes. "The student activists do not sufficiently realize that the movement to reorganize the college constitution began long before they came on the scene, but it has already progressed far beyond their wildest dreams, and that some of their tactics are inimical to success. For their part, the protectors of the old order are mistaken about the true character of the revolt, its extent, and the kinds of remedies which are appropriate." This paperback book is probably of enough documentary worth to warrant a hard-cover edition.

Morton A. Rauh wrote *The Trusteeship of Colleges and Universities* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969). In a sense the title is a misnomer, for the book is really a general treatment of some of the problems and issues in the administration of higher education. Nonetheless, it views these problems from the focus provided by the board of trustees.

After discussing the nature of stewardship or trusteeship, the author indicates the general responsibilities of trustees, such as postulating purposes of institutions, providing for development, choosing the chief executive, and holding assets in trust. He then discusses how boards should relate to presidents, what sorts of presidents they should select, and how they should go about it. Here, a creative note is added by the suggestion that since there is probably no ideal president for a given institution, selective procedures could be a little less refined than they now are. He feels that there are some generally accepted ways in which trustees can function effectively, and he stresses these ways didactically. A president must provide adequate documentation for his board, and boards should operate through well-defined committees composed of working board members, who are the most ideal sort. But the functioning of a board obviously differs according to type of institution; the junior college with a locally elected board functions one way, while the private university has a self-perpetuating board which functions quite differently.

An important portion of the book is the survey of board members, undertaken by the author in conjunction with the Educational Testing Service. This revealed, not surprisingly, that most trustees were white, reasonably wealthy, in their late '50's and early '60's, and not too knowledgeable about the general history and theory of higher education. Most were male and Republican and while they tended to support the abstract notion of academic freedom, yet they did feel, on such issues as invitations accorded controversial speakers, that a board has a right to impose its own standards. The author feels that too frequently college boards have tried to pattern themselves after corporate boards, and have operated far from the campus and in relative anonymity. He favors greater heterogeneity in social class representation on boards and a more democratic selection process. He feels, for example, that faculty members, or even students, should have a voice in choosing trustees, rather than limiting participation to the board members themselves, alumni, or church groups.

The book is sound on description and some prescription, but falls a little short on theoretical notions regarding boards' social roles. And it is grievously short on assessment and on prediction of the future. The author never really discusses whether or not the days of the independent lay board of trustees as a viable instrument of governance are numbered. The book would probably have been strengthened by the addition of some materials on the history of the concept of lay boards of trustees, for the historical episodes from southern Italy and from frontier conditions of the colonial college have important implications for an analysis of present board performance.

Ronald A. Wolk has written *Alternative Methods of Federal Funding for Higher Education* (Berkeley: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1969). This is a serious attempt to review the alternative kinds of federal aid to colleges and universities, and to provide details about the strengths and weaknesses of each method. The book accepts the thesis that between 1862 and 1917 the federal government did little that affected higher education; but that after 1917, and more particularly after World War II, there came an important turning point in federal relations with colleges and universities. The trend during the 1960's has been toward the federal support of higher education as a national goal, and this tendency seems likely to continue.

But there is no consensus on how increased aid will be administered. Five principal types are suggested: categorical aid, which provides funds through grants, contracts, or loans for a specific project; aid to students, which gives grants or loans to students directly or through their schools; grants to institutions, which provide funds for broad or undesignated purposes; tax relief, which gives students and parents exemptions, deductions, or tax credits; and revenue sharing, which returns certain tax monies to the states. After World War II, the government moved most directly into categorical support of research, which was then followed by categorical aid for construction; and then gradually by categorical support of specific educational programs such as medicine or science. Student aid clearly began with the GI Bill, followed by a changed Korean GI Bill, followed by the NDEA-type grants, which in turn led to work-study programs and guaranteed loans.

Several proposals are currently being debated, such as direct scholarship grants of $500 to $1,000 to the student, with some overhead allowances going to the institution. Each of these, of course, has its own supporters. For example, opponents of the tax credit bills claim that such a law would benefit institutions more than students and parents because it would let schools raise their fees, thus capturing all or much of the savings. Educational organizations have tended to oppose tax credit, and private institutions have opposed or been lukewarm toward revenue sharing with the states, on the ground that the states would clearly help public institutions first. Prestige schools like categorical aid, while developing colleges favor institutional grants. An important part of the book is a summary of passed and proposed legislation for federal support, as well as an indication of the positions of several educational organizations.

John Diebold has written *Man and the Computer* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1969), which is composed of speeches and papers which he had delivered over the previous several years. The dramatic language of the first chapter suggests that the book might be a Utopian plea to let the computer solve most of society's vexing problems. He is quite impressed with the growth of computer technology, the unexpected expansion of the computer-producing industry, and the computer's almost limitless potential for handling complex problems involving quantification.

However, in subsequent chapters, all traces of Utopianism disappear as he analyzes the uses of the computer for training managers, identifying international needs, and applying technology to education. Here he points out that while computers could be used to give essential instruction, the enormous cost of developing truly national systems probably puts this development several decades in the future. He describes how in the mid-1960's a number of businesses made premature estimates of the market for educational technology, and industry overexpanded its productive capacity and investment. But it soon became apparent that until the dollars which are currently spent on teachers could be redirected for the purchase of equipment, there would not be a large enough market to warrant heavy institutional commitment.

In spite of the cautious conservatism regarding the uses of computers in education, the author is still persuaded that American technology has taken on a personality and a dynamic of its own, and that the technological possibilities of the computer will expand continuously in the future. The critical issue of the future will be whether or not science and technology can ultimately serve man and be directed and governed by man. Of the several dozen recently published books dealing with computer potentialities, this one is by far the most readable, and in many respects the most thoughtful.

Kenneth G. Patrick and **Richard Eells** have written *Education and the Business Dollar* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1969), which is a study concerned with present and future relationships between the business community and American education. The authors point out that the corporate world knew little about university financial needs during the last part of the nineteenth century and the early part of the twentieth century. Corporate funds, of course, were available to universities through the gifts of such corporate leaders as the Rockefellers, Mellons, and Stanfords. Gradually, and most unconsciously, the business community began to make important contributions to higher education in the 1950's. This came as a response to the solicitations of a very few college presidents, and the efforts of several enlightened business leaders such as the president of Standard Oil of New Jersey to determine whether corporation giving to colleges was legally defensible.

When the book was written, a number of corporations had moved from handling contributions to colleges and universities quite casually to developing definite policies and employing specialized people to help them make wise decisions. As to the future, it seems increasingly clear that if higher education is not to be dominated by increasingly active federal involvement, some sort of third force will be necessary. A number of thoughtful spokesmen, both for universities and for corporations, have looked for ways of increasing corporate giving significantly. There does not seem to be any major objection to marked increases in foundation giving and corporation giving, and business leaders can readily see that what benefits universities benefits them. But the total business community has still not shaped an overall philosophy or policy, nor has it been invited by the total educational community to discuss mutual needs. Much has been achieved, but much more is possible.

This is a well-written, thoughtful book in which the authors have done well their basic scholarship. More such contributions would be welcome and are clearly needed.

J. Douglas Brown, reflecting on his years of distinguished service as dean and provost of Princeton, has written *The Liberal University: An Institutional Analysis* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969).

This book shows with startling clarity all of the many strengths and quite considerable weaknesses of the genre of experienced administrators' reminiscing on the significance of their own experiences for others.

Any college administrator could, with profit, seek to adapt some of the book's many principles and insights about administration into his own practice. But some of the insights are so idiosyncratic or even parochial that the unwary might choose the wrong ones. Brown clearly has Princeton in mind when he talks about the liberal university, and he obviously thinks there are others of the same sort; but few other institutions conform to this model. However, this difficulty in defining the liberal university is not really important.

The author believes in a strong faculty which exercises delegated powers through committees, but he recognizes that without strong administrative leadership, committees become fruitless if not fatuous. He sees the president as being not just a titular head of the institution but an individual clearly in command who exerts his will through personal leadership, through clear appointments, and through administration of the university budget. The author believes that students should have a voice in some matters, but he is clearly not in sympathy with major student intrusions into academic or administrative policy bodies on the campus. Even student discipline should be handled by a mostly faculty committee.

There are thoughtful chapters about academic freedom, tenure, salaries, research, and the surge toward off-campus faculty activities. Brown understands how research and consulting can quickly harm an institution unless careful controls are imposed. The most helpful discussion is that concerning the chief academic officer, who may be called dean of academic affairs, vice-president, or provost. The weakest parts of the book come when he tries to generalize from principles that worked at Princeton. Thus his restricted notion that only those who teach are properly faculty members is one that many institutions simply could not tolerate. While academic experience as a faculty member in a discipline might seem to be valuable for a university president, or for other academic university administrators, this has not been proven.

Some attempts to produce collegiate administrators through programs of higher education have worked, and there is some slight indication that the number of products of such programs in chief administrative roles is increasing. In such programs this book should be an important resource.

Harland G. Bloland has brought together some significant information in his *Higher Education Associations in a Decentralized Education System* (Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1969). He begins with an overlong obeisance to theory regarding the roles of organizations and associations, and an over-elaborate development of a typology. Then follows the essential and valuable part, which is an indication of the types of associations that exist in Washington, how they characteristically deal with issues, how they have in fact dealt with some.

He sees, particularly among the larger associations, a growing rapprochement and a willingness to work together as a common voice for higher education. But he also sees a steady increase in the number of Washington-based associations, and the possibility that this may hurt the hard-won cooperation. Lowland shows how the associations worked together to demand federal construction funds, rather than weakening their power with simultaneous demands for scholarships. He could have gone even deeper and examined the roles played in critical matters by specific individuals, and what effect personality differences may have had. A more refined historical analysis of specific episodes might have been more helpful than this attempt to fit an essentially historical study into a scarcely proven set of organizational theories. (Unrelated to this volume, it is heartening to note that the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education is beginning to produce volumes which can help the profession.)

In *Patterns of Giving to Higher Education* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1968) **Julian H. Levi** and **Fred S. Vorsanger** provide some essential data. The gift experience of 255 institutions during the academic year 1962-63 was examined. The results, well documented by clear and readable tables, indicate that foundations and business concerns are the two largest sources of current expense support, whereas bequests and individual and family gifts are the largest sources for capital purposes. Both public and private institutions have become major recipients of private giving. During the target year, public institutions made a 16.7 percent gain, whereas private institutions actually received less than the previous year. All types of institutions depend primarily upon large gifts. Less than 1 percent of all donor transactions account for approximately 75 percent of all support received, and the outright gift is more productive than life income or annuity contracts. Beyond doubt, this contribution will be used as a constant tool by development officers for some time to come. However, the study should probably be redone, perhaps for the academic year 1969-70, among other things in order to determine the net impact of student protests on giving.

In *The Education Industry* (London: Methuen and Company, 1969), **W. Kenneth Richmond** analyzes through comparative techniques the problems of English education, and attempts to show how better accounting systems and the use of such new management techniques as cost-benefit analysis might help the British people make better use of educational resources. He points out that English education has fallen into the serious trap of adopting as social policy the extension of education to more and more students while still using the techniques that were appropriate when British education was highly elitist. The result is that Britain still has an excessively high dropout rate in spite of making an atypically high per capita governmental contribution to education. By giving virtually full financial support to those who are accepted at colleges and universities, the nation has contributed still further to elitism at a time when the society requires greater democratization. The attempt to specify how general systems theory could be applied is not nearly as helpful as the earlier comparative chapters which point out, perhaps more clearly than ever before, how British adherence to nineteenth-century notions of education may genuinely hurt the country's future.

Beyond doubt, this book will irritate a number of British academicians; but if it is taken seriously it might lead to needed candid discussion. Furthermore, if American educators would raise the same sorts of searching questions about some of their practices, similar reform might be possible.

An attractive how-to-do-it book is *University Space Planning* by

Harlan D. Bareither and **Jerry L. Schillinger** (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1968). This is an attempt to show how the University of Illinois has made space utilization studies and how use of the numeric method can help institutions decide on their future physical space requirements. The general philosophy of the numeric method for determining requirements is that the physical facility requirements may be characterized into building blocks, with each building block having an index which will be used to point out specific space requirements. Thus the whole scheme allows planners to make an abstract decision about amount and type of space before they actually plan the buildings. Obviously, the book is not bedtime reading, but it should be of considerable help to the currently active planning field.

In an unpublished report, **Robert A. Altman** has produced *A Study of the Establishment of Upper Division Colleges in the United States* (Washington: Bureau of Research, Office of Education, 1969). In it, using historical techniques, the author examines the reasons for the founding of nine upper division colleges, from the earliest, The College of the Pacific, to the most recent, Richmond College on Staten Island. He finds that most were created in order to exploit local conditions or *ad hoc* favorable conditions; and suggests that at least several of the institutions became full four-year schools when those temporary conditions changed.

Nothing in the report validates the idea of an upper two-year institution, although the concept has existed since the turn of the century, when William Rainey Harper and David Starr Jordan urged their respective boards to eliminate lower division work. There is, of course, a rationale for upper division institutions which is constantly espoused by such people as A. J. Brumbaugh, and several states are seriously considering the idea. However, before making the move, they might look at the two Florida institutions—Florida Atlantic and the University of West Florida—which represent the most consciously developed plan. One hopes that this USOE supported study will be published in more durable form. As a status report there is nothing like it in the literature.

John D. Millett has produced a brief pamphlet-sized report on *Government in the American University* (Toledo: The Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1969). After reviewing the ways in which the American style of governance has evolved, he comes to his significant thesis, which is well worth reading. He believes the university can not be permitted to subvert its role as educator of professional talent. He feels that the faculty struggle for power is based essentially on faculty members' desire for status, and sees no reason why extreme faculty demands should be granted. Nor does he find any particular reason for intimate involvement of students in a structure of government. One only hopes that Millett will expand these ideas and perhaps illuminate them with appropriate case materials.

Warren W. Willingham and **Nurhan Findikyan** have written *Patterns of Admission for Transfer Students* (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1969). In this brief but revealing monograph, they provide questionnaire evidence which certainly supports the recent impression that students are transferring more between institutions. While most transfers take place between four-year schools, the contribution of the two-year institutions is increasing. Most transfers occur within a state, but there is substantially more interstate migration between private colleges. While transfer is on the increase, most institutions have not worked out specific recruiting devices to make it easier, and transfer students' loss of academic credit suggests that these procedures should probably be reviewed and revised. Two major barriers keep students from transferring: the lack of immediately available financial aids and spotty or poor previous collegiate records.

D. Parker Young has written *The Legal Aspects of Student Discipline in Higher Education* (Athens: Institute of Higher Education, 1969), which presents in brief form recent legal interpretations of significance for colleges and universities. This is no substitute for M. M. Chambers' periodic résumés of legal decisions; but as a quick overview, it seems valuable. The author finds that since the values to the individual of higher education have been enhanced, the courts have been more zealous in upholding the rights of citizens to receive such an education. Furthermore, the courts have begun to depart somewhat from the doctrine of judicial nonintervention in student discipline, and are beginning to demand in student disciplinary actions at least rudimentary elements of fair play.

Introductory Papers on Institutional Research (Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1968) presents papers delivered at a 1967 conference held to assess the state of the art of institutional research. Although institutional research as a concept is at least a half-century old, it has experienced its most luxuriant growth since about 1959. As institutions became more and more complex and expanded their efforts during the early 1960's, they found they needed more precise information to function effectively. Out of this period came, if not a tidal wave of reports, certainly more information than ever before in the history of American higher education. Some of the better studies analyzed how faculty members used their time, how future enrollments could be predicted on the basis of historical trends, and how enrollment projections could be translated into staff and faculty needs. The greatest amount of institutional research may have been done on college admissions and prediction of academic success. While some of these studies are relatively easy to replicate, more sophisticated research on multiple criteria for admissions and more refined grading techniques should be on the agenda.

While several of the technical papers included are somewhat discrete, when this book is added to the proceedings of the Association for Institutional Research, and some of the workshop proceedings from such places as the University of California at Berkeley, the result is a reasonable catalog of research and research findings. The Southern Regional Educational Board should take considerable pleasure in noting its own role in helping the South to appreciate what institutional research can really accomplish.

John D. Millett has written *Decision Making and Administration in Higher Education* (Richmond: The Kent State University Press, 1968) or, more appropriately, combined some of his previously prepared papers into a coherent book. As the author points out, the essays are based on years of experience in higher educational administration. The insights show how valid that experience was. He feels that the thrust toward superinstitutional coordination and control is inexorable, which underscores the need for new patterns of decision making, and he favors some form of sharing rather than an adversary style. While Millett favors shared responsibility, he realistically recognizes the urge toward unionization and collective bargaining, especially in those institutions in which teaching is the main activity. He also recognizes the significance of recent student efforts to secure greater influence, but does not believe students should actually make decisions. He points out that higher education has become so significant, so expensive, and so complex that long-range planning must be more rational. Here he is inclined to see potential for the currently popular systems analysis. And he feels that while the essential financial problems facing higher education must still be considered fundamentally within an institutional context, larger units of government will cooperate and engage in central planning for financial needs in the future.

Running throughout this short book is the notion that the various elements of a university can communicate and that "communication is life, endeavor, quest. No university has any reality without it. Communication is a pearl of creation, an act of artistry, a product of skill. No university can perform its mission without it. Communication is prelude to action, guidepost to perfectibility. Without it no university is a university in its service to civilization."

Gene A. Budig has prepared a short pamphlet called *Governors and Higher Education* as one of the University of Nebraska Contribution to Education Series, but it is scarcely that. The book consists of quotes taken from governors' public utterances about higher education. The author makes no attempt to assess the context of the speeches, or the relative impact of speeches by different governors on the process of higher education. One detects no particular sampling technique. The result gives the impression that the quotes were taken from things that the author accidentally came across. The book has scant value for anyone.

Leadership in Higher Education (Oakland: Western College Association, 1969) is the printed proceedings of the Western College Association's annual meeting. It does little more than summarize an existing body of clichés about higher education that are stated too frequently in speeches. Thus, a trustee supports the role of trustees in maintaining a university and questions the propriety of faculties ever assuming full responsibility. Another speaker stresses that the ideal university is a community of inquirers, all seeking after truth, whose efforts must be coordinated by an effective college president. And a spokesman for the AAUP quite logically urges that faculty and administration share leadership. The speakers have made most of these statements in other places and quite often in much better style.

Mary Kemper Gunn's *A Guide to Academic Protocol* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969) is a fluff book that combines personal opinion based on the somewhat parochial experience at Columbia and standard common sense on the subject of preparing for events such as receptions and teas, convocations, dinners, lectures, and commencements. The personal flavor is in the author's judgment that "sandwiches made of roast beef, chicken, turkey, ham, or ham and cheese are by far the favorites of young people," and the commonsense part says that in planning for an event such things as place and time, guest lists and invitations, decorations, and music should be considered. The book contains little that could not be found in any of several standard books of etiquette, but perhaps the publication of this document is one more attempt to refurbish Columbia's image.

Oakley J. Gordon has edited *Profess or Perish* (Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 1968), which presents papers delivered at the Thirtieth Annual Pacific Northwest Conference on Higher Education. For the most part, the papers come from the reforming wing of the American professoriat, with Edward J. Shoben pointing out the implications of departmentalism and Daniel G. Aldridge, Jr. suggesting how a complex university might be reorganized along nondepartmental lines. The third author grapples, rather unsuccessfully, with finding other criteria for professional advance than research, and Edith Green argues her long-recognized position that more federal support can and should be made available for higher education and would not imply federal control. The paperback format is probably proper for these essays, none of which seem to have reached the heights their authors have achieved at other times.

Joel Howell has written an anachronism in *So You're Going to Be a Dean of Men* (Nashville: Division of Higher Education, Board of Education in the United Methodist Church, 1969). Mr. Howell, using his own recollected doctoral oral examination, espouses a theory of student personnel work. The theory is essentially benevolent paternalism, based on the ill-disguised belief that college students are probably depraved but nonetheless lovable.

The author sees the dean of men as spending most of his time on disciplinary matters, as well as actually contriving and appointing various student judicial councils, personally setting limits on student behavior, and then insisting that students function within those limits. Possibly as a reflection of Methodism, he sees drinking as the most common problem a dean must face each fall; he believes that institutions should discourage drinking, but in a nice and contrived way. At one point in his soliloquy, the author advances the peculiar doctrine that if a student's off-campus activities become objects of public recognition and concern, the institution may rightfully take action "on the basis of the student's responsibility to the university." For a book written in 1969, the section asserting that integration is a serious and debatable matter seems painfully naïve; one wonders how the author would face the rage of a black power group.

By and large this small book espouses the student personnel doctrine of the 1930's, and the author seems insensitive to the powerful forces and complexities of university campuses in 1969. When students are demanding membership on boards of trustees and faculty committees to discuss gradualism in granting student control over residence hall living, the book seems just a little anachronistic.

Two brief pamphlets produced by the Western Interstate Commission should be considered together. One is *Memo to New Department Chairmen* by **Wilbert J. McKeachie,** and the other *Faculty Recruitment* by **David G. Brown.** McKeachie's statement is based on years of close observation within the university and considerable experience as head of what is probably the world's largest psychology department. He ends up suggesting that recruitment is one of the department head's most time-consuming tasks. Then, in the second monograph, Brown suggests how to go about it. He refutes the long-held notion that college and university appointments are rarely made as a result of definite overt effort by the person seeking a position. Apparently even the cold turkey widely distributed letters of application do pay off, as do more informal means. These two monographs are produced by the Commission's new Department Chairman Program.

Arthur M. Cohen and **Florence B. Brawer** have prepared *Measuring Faculty Performance* (Los Angeles: ERIC Clearing House for Junior College Information, 1969), a reasonably adequate résumé of the history and present state of college teaching evaluation. There are more comprehensive summaries, but this one gives enough examples to illustrate, if not support, such generalizations as that student evaluation of teacher performance can be quite reliable and consistent. The authors correctly point out that most studies of teacher effectiveness have suffered from the criterion problem (against what should teacher characteristics and behavior be compared?) and suggest that student gains should be the essential criterion. However, the authors seem a little glib in saying this without dealing with the logistical as well as the psychological problems of measuring student gains in any widespread way. When one thinks of the cost of simply administering the three area tests of the Graduate Record Examination to four or five thousand students, the task of making a more refined assessment of student outcomes in any systematic way seems at this time beyond most institutional resources.

Problems of Different Types of Institutions

A major contribution to the serious literature of higher education is **Morris Keeton** and **Conrad Hilberry's** *Struggle and Promise: A Future for Colleges* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969). The authors directed a comparative study of a number of liberal arts colleges, using teams of visitors to develop profiles of the campuses, which could then be compared. This book presents profiles of a number of quite unique institutions, such as Wheaton College in Illinois or Goddard College in Vermont. The profiles themselves are short and incisive, having something of the literary flair of the late David Boroff's *Campus U.S.A.*, but with a much more firmly established empirical base. Thus the visitors present both their own reactions and psychometric data on such things as campus press. Each profile points out problems that these institutions must solve. Wheaton College must struggle to maintain its evangelical stance in an increasingly sensate world, Amherst must struggle to maintain a scholarly faculty on a small college campus in an age of universities, Berea College must struggle with finances to maintain its traditional free tuition policy as it attempts to serve poor students from the Appalachian area, and all except the well endowed must struggle with finances in a time of steadily escalating costs.

Interspersed between the profiles of colleges are sections of analysis and argument that represent as much the authors' educational philosophies as principles derived from the case studies. Keeton and Hilberry believe that the good college of the future should be characterized by active engagement in a network of educational opportunities beyond campus boundaries; by the variety of its students and their responsibilities for their own education; by the colorful and diverse careers of faculty; by individualization, sophistication, and rich rewards of its life of learning; and by complexity of purpose. The authors believe in universal higher education, and outline a suggested program of federal support for both public and private institutions. Among a number of telling points, the authors show how futile it is to talk in the abstract about institutional excellence. They establish that students who would be happy at Wheaton very probably could not tolerate Goddard, and that students who would like Amherst would be decidedly unhappy at St. Thomas. Yet each of these four institutions seems to be doing a creditable job with the students they attract. The authors also reveal, time and time again, the powerful significance of students themselves as an educational force. Students come off much better than do faculty members. And, the authors struggle with a conception of what a liberal education might be, attempting to go beyond a preoccupation with a given set of subjects and extreme rationality:

> The approach we suggest would begin simply with a setting aside of all dogmas except commitment to the aims that remain constant in liberal education. The next step would be to take a look at the variables that affect the achievement of those aims at a

> specific college—the background and intellectual habits of students, the interests and training of the faculty, resources such as money, buildings and equipment, location, the institution's religious, political, or intellectual traditions and its social context. With this yarn and dye as its raw materials, a college must weave a course of study that serves its students and bears the college's distinctive shades and patterns.

The weakest part of the book is the authors' failure to anticipate the profound differences between the 1960's and the 1970's. Thus, they pass over rather quickly the growing competition of large tax-supported institutions which rely on tuition for basic operations. In a sense, using Amherst, Wheaton, and Berea as three of a limited number of cases, the authors may distort an analysis which could otherwise have helped the vast majority of liberal arts colleges. Most don't even have the modest endowments of those institutions. But in spite of this weakness, the book should move into a central position in the literature.

Tilden J. LeMelle and **Wilbert J. LeMelle,** in *The Black College* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1969), attempt to understand and make clear both the serious failure of black colleges and ways of improving them that are consistent with the fact of blackness in American society. The authors are persuaded that black colleges should not try to copy the practices and goals of predominantly white institutions, for this can only perpetuate a second-class existence. They believe that in the late 1960's black colleges had their first real chance to clarify their purpose and devote themselves to developing black Americans.

The authors are convinced that previous studies of predominantly Negro institutions were simply ineffective surveys of how far Negro institutions had moved toward a mythical mainstream of American higher education. Hence, each study would give a somewhat minority view of perhaps a majority of the black institutions. Not that institutions do not deserve criticism, but the use of the mainstream criterion conceals the real deficiencies of those colleges. Their real failure has been in not dealing with the special needs for the social development of black Americans. They have not helped the blacks accept their separateness and still exist alongside of the white community. Among other things, black colleges did not try to develop black entrepreneurs who could establish and perpetuate a more solid economic base.

In the past, Negro educators have believed in accommodation, which is expressed well by Booker Washington, and reconciliation, which is really accommodation without subservience, and which leads to the elitist ideology stressed by DuBois in his concerns for the talented tenth. More recently, the ideologies of separatism, or black nationalism, and of black mobilization have arisen as counterpoints. Their adherents are especially critical of black liberal idealism, whose adherents assume that eventually the best ideals of American civilization will prevail, and that the black community will be brought into the mainstream of American life.

Up until this point, the arguments are as clear and as cogent as any found in the growing literature about black higher education. But as the authors begin to discuss their suggested reforms, they begin to falter. They would clearly emphasize economic and business curricula, stress separatism, and adopt a number of the prevailing administrative and organizational reforms being bandied about the full higher education community. Thus they favor the establishment of consortia, the reconstruction of boards of trustees to include faculties and students, and the use of long-range planning.

In a sense, their suggested remedies are a mixture of demands for black history, sociology, and so forth, and a black point of view, together with orthodox reforms being attempted by both black and white. This weakness of the latter section does not seriously impair the book as a whole. These authors are attempting to solve an as yet unsolved problem, and they come closer to a theoretical resolution than most. This book and the earlier mentioned *Symposium on Black Studies* could provide a theoretical base for a big leap forward.

William B. Faherty, S.J., has written *Better the Dream: St. Louis: University and Community, 1818-1968* (St. Louis: St. Louis University, 1968), a much better than typical institutional history. The author has tried to relate institutional evolution both to the community itself and to broad social developments. He finds that up to the end of the Civil War, St. Louis University developed in concert with and in response to the conditions of the developing community of St. Louis. Although the institution was conducted by a religious order, its concerns far transcended the needs of Missouri Catholics. Its early leaders participated vigorously in the secular development of the city and revealed a responsiveness to general community-wide needs by such acts as the early creation of a medical school.

However, after the war, the primacy of St. Louis as the gateway to the West began to fade. Other collegiate institutions, such as Washington University, began to compete, and the faculty and administration of St. Louis University began to lose flexibility and responsiveness. While other institutions were embracing science and the technology, St. Louis' curriculum remained humanistic, philosophic, and increasingly liturgical.

By the end of the century, a number of forces began to move St. Louis back into the mainstream of community life, and it assumed once again the national and international visibility of a distinguished Catholic university. This return to the mainstream culminated during the administration of Father Paul C. Reinert, under whose leadership the curriculum was revitalized, the library acquired microfilm of the Vatican Archives, and the Board of Trustees was secularized.

This is such an excellent history that one is reluctant to criticize. However, the analysis of the recent periods seemed a little too superficial and a little too laudatory, overlooking some of the institution's real future problems. Then the author fell too quickly into the trap set for all institutional biographers, that of using too many names of individuals without giving them substance. One would guess that 50 to 75 pages of this heavy volume might have been eliminated with less listing of individuals. Overall, however, the author is a master of his craft, and the possessor of an effective pen.

Henry Allen Bullock has written *A History of Negro Education in the South* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1969), which won the Bancroft Prize for 1968. He demonstrates that for a number of humanitarian and practical reasons, which were frequently contrary to colonial and state law, the education of Negroes to function in a slave but nonetheless assimilated society preoccupied many Southerners. This tradition of concern for education determined some of the early attempts to help freedmen accommodate to their new status after the Civil War. The seeds of the ultimate Southern segregated educational system, which came to predominate in the last part of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century, were sown through the early reconstruction of President Johnson. These tendencies were momentarily set aside when Congressional reconstruction was attempted, but were reasserted in the 1870's when home rule was restored in the South. Time and again he shows how susceptible Negroes were to education when educational imagination and philanthropic support were combined.

Then in the middle of the twentieth century, the evolutionary process of Negro movement into society resumed. This movement was made possible partly by the products of predominantly Negro institutions in the South, and was symbolized by such things as the Supreme Court school desegregation decision of 1954 and the civil rights acts of the 1960's. Much of this change was intensified by the various protests in the South, such as the student sit-ins. In the author's judgment, evolution toward assimilation seems not only the only consistent outcome but the best one for the black community. Thus he is inclined to minimize the long-term significance of the recent antithetical development of black separatism.

This is a remarkable and an optimistic book. To be sure, the author does accept one interpretation of the Civil War and Reconstruction, but so does every other historian of the period. As a contemporary historian, he is not afraid to use quantifiable information, yet still uses more traditional sorts of historical data.

John E. Cantelon, in *College Education and the Campus Revolution* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), makes an effort to find ways for the liberal arts college to remain viable. He argues that the college really is expected to and must assume many of the functions previously performed by the Church. In the past, liberal arts colleges interpreted the principal achievements of Western man and prepared students for a vocational life, but these two functions no longer seem sufficient to justify these colleges' continued existence. In the past the Church was considered the agency which could provide the basic meaning structures which hold society together. However, more and more students are coming to regard the Church as a corporation, a conservator of past social values, and a convenient service center which sponsors a host of social functions, from Boy Scout troops to Golden Age clubs. Nevertheless, basic meaning structures are still needed, and the performance of that function falls more and more to the liberal arts college, which is decidedly not prepared for the assignment. But, previous experience suggests that colleges can change to assume such a responsibility. In the past, American colleges and universities began to educate the people for political responsibility. Since this need continues, colleges must fulfill a kingly as well as a priestly function.

As if these goals were not enough, the author argues that the college quite properly should be called upon to act as a parent, since there is an alleged drop in family influence. The religious analogy is used still further as the author examines other periods of social reform. The Protestant Reformation originated as an academic movement, then became a religious reformation of the total society; this was similar to the Christian revolt away from prevailing Judaism. The West may now be living through a third great reformation of Christianity, and the liberal arts college may become a prime instrument for achieving it. Colleges must therefore reorder the curriculum in such a way as to give students insights into the present zeitgeist and the critical tools for dealing with it creatively.

Such a curriculum would be issue-oriented and would demonstrate to the present generation unsympathy for dispassionate intellectual detachment. Such a reform might endanger the financial security of institutions which have become more and more secular in response to presumed needs of the market place. To balance this loss, churches might turn over some of their unused property to support education, since colleges are expected to perform some of the missions which the traditional church used to perform.

The author's ideas are intriguing, but he does seem a trifle naïve when he says, "In a very real sense the working out of details of general education curriculum is a relatively minor problem." As one who has spent years trying to do such a thing, I find such a statement hopelessly sanguine. Then, too, the author's plea that colleges take over one more function would probably lead to their final breakdown if it were heeded. There is the point of view that much collegiate failure has occurred because colleges have attempted to do too much, hence have done nothing well. Making the student union the twentieth-century cathedral just might not work. (Only as a mild criticism, the author might have quoted from the full text of one of my papers, rather than from a newspaper account.)

Sidney S. Letter edited *New Prospects for the Small Liberal Arts College* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1968), a collection of papers delivered at a 1967 conference for presidents of small private liberal arts colleges. The essays contain little that is really new, but some of the restatements deserve publication.

Earl J. McGrath calls for much greater attention to student needs and says that teaching should be the primary activity in liberal arts colleges. He feels that the quest for high selectivity is misguided and somewhat inconsistent with the traditional liberal arts college open-door policy. As usual, he is against the highly specialized graduate-school-oriented curriculum and suggests that liberal arts colleges might well set as their dominant goal the cultivation of the cultured human being. He also believes that, for better or for worse, students will be increasingly involved in governance.

Peter Drucker, searching for a financial basis for the independent college, first of all justifies the existence of colleges on the ground that they preserve diversity, then defends their receipt of tax dollars on the ground that in the long run this is cheaper for taxpayers than creating new compelling tax-supported schools.

Nevitt Sanford, with his psychologically based idealism, tries to describe his ideal liberal arts college by stressing, in an almost Old Testament way, the virtues of love, justice, respect, and trust. If these virtues are mutually displayed by students and faculty, the institution may be an effective one. Sanford here, as in so many of his writings, could almost be called a neoclassicist, for he finds the parameters of his ideals in the classical curriculum.

There is also the plea for increased institutional cooperation, based in part on the observation that by 1967 there were at least 1300 good examples of cooperative enterprises. And similarly current is the suggestion that students do have a productive role in the governance of collegiate institutions, and should be allowed to take part. Isolated though the small liberal arts college might be geographically, each one can and should properly be concerned with international education and world affairs. In the small institution a student in the future might well have the greatest chance of learning to understand and appreciate the complexities of an international culture.

Cornelius M. Cuyler edited *The Identity of the Minor Seminary: What Is Its Future?* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1969), which reflects the waves of reform and change which are so radically changing all of Catholic education. For generations, such things as the primacy of classical languages in the curriculum of both major and minor seminaries, and the virtues of beginning early training for ultimate celibacy, were accepted without question. But as the Vatican accepted the use of the vernacular, the ultimate values of Latin began to be questioned. Open discussion of celibacy has raised serious questions as to whether this should be stressed in seminary training (since before the high-school-aged seminarian is ordained, celibacy as a requirement may well have been foregone). Within the major seminaries, the earlier reliance on theology, philosophy, and dogmatic religion as the central elements of the curriculum has given way to a preoccupation with the liberal arts, which are seen as humanizing the student.

The total impression which this series of papers leaves is that the reformation movement which is hitting all other types of education extends to Roman Catholic seminaries, and that even more radical change may be anticipated in the future.

James H. Sumberge elected to make his five-year annual report in book form and call it *Grand Valley State College: Its Developmental Years 1964-1968* (Allandale, Mich.: Grand Valley State College, 1969). This college, created by the Michigan legislature, chose to become a separate institution with its own board of trustees rather than a branch of one of the large state universities.

The institution was created as an undergraduate college, and at the end of five years that intention still is a governing principle. The college did, in its early days, make some grievous mistakes. For example, its faculty, adhering to a rather rigid notion of curricular structure, imposed a prescribed freshman year program which students rejected almost categorically. This led to student criticism and then a lack of interest on the part of prospective students.

The book treats collegiate functioning, student activities, governance, characteristics of the student body, academic affairs, financial affairs, accreditation, and building and facilities descriptively and in reasonably clear language. The president does not intend to interpret the evolution of his institution in historical or sociological terms, but he has provided the raw material for subsequent theorists to interpret. It is too bad that presidents of other freshly created institutions have not done as Sumberge did—recorded in a semipermanent form the critical information during the critical years. This document almost suggests that a keep-and-record project later concerted into book form should be axiomatic for any new institution.

Illustrative of the profound changes in American education since World War II is a volume about life at Columbia, edited by **Wesley W. First,** called *University on the Heights* (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1969). This is simply a collection of somewhat nostalgic essays about Columbia by reasonably articulate former students. Each one saw something different in the College which he valued. However, an underlying thread in many of the essays is an awareness of some idiosyncratic or charismatic individual. The trait remembered might be temper or tranquillity, but it belonged to a man who made the College memorable. A few authors, however, find other elements to the College's uniqueness. One, for example, says: "It is so uniquely saturated with the sounds and sights, the rhythms and the values of civilization as it actually exists today." These little essays are probably archaic, but there is something pleasant in reading this sort of description:

> For me the College was not an introduction to practical politics or even to practical social life. I went out for track and the freshman crew, drank beer in the sessions at the Gold Rail, went to dances at Barnard and pursued a raven-haired graduate student who spent her evenings studying aesthetics in the main reading room of South Hall. At one point I fell in with a circle of primeval hipsters who identified themselves with Columbia without any formal affiliation. Despite these diversions, the College seemed to me primarily an intellectual experience, not so much a way of life as the confrontation of raw adolescent minds with an extraordinary brilliant and unified company of scholars. The unity, I am sure, was largely unconscious and certainly unintended; but it was so unmistakable that the dozen teachers to whom I was exposed seemed to share a common viewpoint, the elements of which have become clear to me with the passage of time.

Then the impassioned and vindictive rhetoric of the Mark Rudds in the spring of 1968. These essays reflect a world gone, just as did *Gone With the Wind.*

James C. Stone continues his love affair with teacher education in a noncritical and nonevaluative book called *Breakthrough in Teacher Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968). Stone was retained by the Ford Foundation to visit a number of institutions which had received Ford grants to improve teacher education. He found such changes as shortening the amount of work in professional education, using more internships, and rearranging the sequence of courses being made at many schools. The author finds these changes "exciting," "extraordinarily successful," "infectious," and "unusually innovative," but rarely tells us why. One also suspects that he might have been unduly influenced by a few people at each institution who had a professional stake in portraying a high degree of success. Illustrative of his brand of "scholarship" are the rave notices given to the personality of Sister Jacqueline Grennan at Webster College, from which he infers that Webster has become a first rate "institution" as a result of the Ford grant. Even Sister Jacqueline herself does not claim that sort of achievement (she called it a fifth rate school that became third rate).

The author is careful to point out that many of the things he saw differ markedly from previous performance, but never shows us precisely how. Thus he argues that the teaching internship differs markedly from practice teaching. This reviewer, however, has also visited some of the internship programs described and finds little more supervision than existed in the laissez-faire days. The purpose of the Ford Foundation can be commended, as well as the author's desire to present results for dissemination. In the long run, however, a more critical appraisal would have been infinitely superior to this rhapsody.

Arthur M. Cohen has written *Dateline '79: Heretical Concepts for the Community College* (Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1969), a liberal futuristic portrayal of education. He anticipates much greater flexibility and much greater reliance on the technology in the 1970's, and he expects courses to be produced which will be much more relevant to student needs. Most of his anticipations seem good and valid. However, one would like a little bit more information regarding actual trends extrapolated from present developments.

The author may be using the book to call attention to present malpractices, making it really a reforming tool rather than a prediction. If this is his purpose, then we must ask whether writing futuristic or Utopian literature is the best way to change such a complex institution as education. The history of Utopian literature suggests that it has not been a very effective tool of social criticism, but that is only a mild caveat. The book deserves a great deal of attention, if only because it is one of the few coming out of the domain of junior college education that do not idolize the junior college and everything occurring within it. From another angle, this book is almost a complete catalog of reforming ideas in higher education, and the bibliography suggests that the author is quite familiar with most of the critics and reformers currently writing.

Student criticism and a gradual awareness on the part of administrators have led a number of colleges and universities to conduct institutional studies and long-range plans. A few of these are published and have become part of the literature of higher education. The quality is quite mixed, just as is the style for the conduct of the studies.

Stanford University has produced an attractive 10-volume report, *The Study of Education at Stanford,* with separate volumes dealing with The Study and Its Purposes, University Residences and Campus Life, Undergraduate Education, Governance, Admissions, Government Programs, and the like. This study was directed by an associate provost, with adequate staff assistance, and through a series of interlocking committees was designed to cover the full University. These reports are reasonably but not vindictively critical of existing practices, but do make far-reaching recommendations which were discussed during the academic year 1968-69. A good example is the volume on Undergraduate Education, which finds that the older prescribed general education program is no longer appropriate for Stanford students or faculty. It recommends the abolition of the foreign language, History of Civilization, and mathematics requirements, and even suggests that the University change to an A-B-C system of grading, on the ground that in such a selective institution the grades D and F are unnecessarily punitive. The whole series is no idealistic exercise, but fully accepts the realities of campus politics. For example, an elaborate rationale is presented to alleviate the fears of foreign language departments that their enrollment would be smaller if the language requirement were abolished.

Much less good is *The Construction of an American College* by

Warren I. Susman (New Brunswick: Rutgers University, 1969). Susman was commissioned to make a one-man résumé of Rutgers and to prepare a report containing specific recommendations. It is too bad that Rutgers did not choose someone more familiar with the history of higher education and the dynamics of educational reform. The author is addicted to hyperbole, making such indefensible statements as "No previous generation has been so self-aware, so concerned about its own identity." He is quite critical of academic accounting, the encouragement of competition, and the whole environment that is the contemporary college, but does not try to understand the underlying functions of some of these bureaucratic structures. He clearly wants some sort of romantic reform, but ensures its impossibility by insisting that any effort to weaken the role of departments would weaken the whole college. It is, of course, departmentalism that has led to the things that Susman decries. His solution includes many palliatives, but rests on a cross-sectional division of the institution. Separate schools of humanistic studies, social studies, scientific studies, and applied scientific studies would be stretched along one axis, with departments on the other. The schools are intended to teach and transmit culture, while the departments are to be concerned with research and specialized instruction. It is quite obvious that he has not looked intensively at past failures along these lines.

Another indication of the report's lack of reality is Susman's notion that Rutgers should insist on all entering students having at least three years of one foreign language. Actually, New Jersey cannot now or within the next decade produce enough teachers to offer high school students three years of a foreign language. One hopes that Rutgers can obtain some value from this report; quite clearly the profession at large cannot.

The University of Oklahoma used a committee technique to present its recommendations in *The Future of the University*, edited by **Gordon A. Christenson.** This study was conducted during an interregnum when a President-designate was actually on the job but the incumbent President was still conducting ongoing administration. This report does offer insights about the ailments of collegiate education, pointing out that many courses are superficial, that the curriculum may not have accommodated the diversity of student backgrounds, and that the University of Oklahoma is probably a more likely place for change to occur than in institutions on either the East or the West Coast.

The overall impression from the report, however, is that the only changes needed are minor modifications in such areas as academic governance, budget-making, and the like. The report assumes that undergraduate education, continuing education, graduate professional education, research, and service will all be stressed. It would have been helpful if the Committee had suggested criteria for allocating resources for these purposes. As a codification of conventional wisdom, the report is excellent and could be assigned to all aspiring administrators, or indeed to all aspiring faculty members, to show them what a complex institution in the mid-continent looks like, and how it will probably develop. The report clearly is not Utopian, and does not suggest radical innovation.

Drugs and Students

Dust Bowl empiricism shows clearly in **Richard H. Blum** and associates' *Students and Drugs* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969). This is one of two large volumes presenting the results of several years of intensive questionnaire and interview research on drug use, its incidence on college campuses, and biographical and personality concomitants of variations in drug use. The phrase "Dust Bowl empiricism" is used because so much of the substance consists of showing how one portion of a group compared with another portion doing something concerning drugs. The pattern which emerges is not particularly surprising. Users of a number of different drugs, legal or illegal, strong or mild, are more inclined to go still further with drugs than nonusers. Students seem generally disposed by personality toward or against psychoactive drug use. Nonusers tend to come from satisfied, close-to-family, moderate, religiously active, ideologically stable, technology-oriented groups of younger lowerclassmen. The more frequent users of such things as LSD or marijuana tend in the direction of religious noninvolvement, a pattern of opposition to parents and conventional values, and somewhat more than average political involvement. Social differences do appear between marijuana and LSD users, for each act relates to a consistent life style.

It is probably well that this catalog is available, for no one else has dared compile such data. Others can now put together some of the empirical conclusions into at least a hypothetical theory to help college administrators think through appropriate stances regarding drug use. The most coherent of the chapters has indeed begun to do this; Helen Nowlis' excellent liberal overview for administrators assigns meaning to the raw data.

What is really missing from this book is the feeling that the author assimilated his information, pondered it deeply, and then interpreted it coherently. One could almost wish that behavioral scientists all had some training and experience in historiography or the treatment of historical data allowing eventually a synthesis and interpretation, which is what this book seriously needs.

Probably the most dangerous book on this controversial subject is *Drug Abuse: Escape to Nowhere* (Philadelphia: Smith Kline and French Laboratories, 1967), which is mentioned here only because it contrasts so poorly with the analysis by Helen Nowlis. This one describes the variety of drugs and seems to take a generally punitive stance, although it does give occasional glances in the direction of therapy. The advisory panel consists of no psychiatrist, two police officers, several high school teachers, and professors of health education. Throughout the book quotations and evidence seem to be loaded; they come mainly from those absolutely convinced of the ill effects of all drugs, while none of the evidence suggesting that marijuana may not be that bad is offered.

2

Much more informative is **Richard R. Lingeman's** *Drugs From A to Z: A Dictionary* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969). There is no attempt to develop any sort of party line; rather, precise, objective definitions of the total language of drugs, drug uses, and drug prevention are given.

By far the most helpful work on drugs is **Helen H. Nowlis'** *Drugs on the College Campus* (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1969), which, in 109 well-written pages, summarizes known facts about the commonest drugs, indicates something of the role those drugs have come to play in the college culture, gives the principal provisions of appropriate laws, and analyzes the problems institutions face as they attempt to respond to increased drug use.

Dr. Nowlis' general openness about her subject is reflected by her concluding statement, which says: "This is in part what the drug problem is all about. Adults with their alcohol and tranquilizers, students with their marijuana and LSD are both reacting to conditions which negate human values and human worth. The main differences is that the adults' drugs of choice are depressants taken to blunt the pain; the students' drugs of choice are rightly or wrongly used, as an attempt to strike back, to seek insight into, to protest what they see to be the causes of pain. It is a reasonable prediction that if all drugs were eliminated from the campus tomorrow, the search would go on in some other form, perhaps more tolerable to society, perhaps less."

Clarence H. Faust and **Jessica Feingold** have edited *Approaches to Education for Character* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969), a collection of papers prepared for and delivered at the Seventeenth Conference on Science, Philosophy, and Religion. The essays range from a theoretical argument by a philosopher about the elements of a moral life to descriptions of the need for developing civic responsibility. Quite a number of the essays discussed specific programs of institutions trying to educate for character, but there is little precise assessment of these programs. The biggest gap in the collection is the lack of systematic presentation of insights from psychology and social psychology.

One of the more useful papers was prepared by Stephen J. Bailey, who attempted to show how an examination of historical theories about character development and an examination of successful school practice in the past could be converted into a charter for contemporary practice. He shows how the British educational system was designed to produce the British Colonial Service which served so responsibly and effectively during the nineteenth century. Clarence Faust really provides the focus for the entire book in his concluding essay on "Reflections on Education and Character." He ends up with the belief that the ideas and views of youth and the wisdom and experience of their elders can ultimately be combined to help young people develop a new and responsible system of ethics, which will not rely on past dogma but will govern human behavior and conduct.

The symposium's subject is a sticky one, and it is good that thoughtful individuals were brought together to discuss it candidly. The last such book, *The Larger Learning*, edited by Marjorie Carpenter, was much briefer. Faust's contribution goes much beyond that earlier work, which limited itself to the value of general education courses.

The National Academy of Sciences has brought out the second of its Career Patterns Reports, *Careers of Ph.D.'s: Academic Versus Non-Academic* (Washington: National Academy of Sciences, 1969). This is a survey of 10,000 holders of third-level research degrees selected from the graduating classes of 1935, 1940, 1945, 1950, 1955, and 1960. It reveals that half of the Ph.D.'s spend their careers entirely in academic employment. No background or educational variables seem to be systematically related to the career choice. Doctorate holders in nonacademic work earned slightly more money. As has been generally recognized, the instructor rank is quickly disappearing as the starting rank for possessors of doctorates. Also, young doctorate holders advance faster than older ones. The midwest has been the largest single geographic source of Ph.D.'s, and the South a major absorber of these people later in their careers. In general, the social base from which Ph.D.'s have come has expanded, with younger Ph.D.'s coming from a wider socioeconomic base. There is a wealth of tabular material in this report. One hopes that the National Academy of Sciences will continue this series.

Douglas H. Heath has written *Growing Up in College* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968), a detailed case study of how students develop at Haverford. The author's concept of maturity includes development of intellectual skills, crystallization of values, growth of self-knowledge, and maturing of interpersonal skills. To become a more mature person is to become more able to symbolize one's experience and to become more other-centered, integrated, stable, and autonomous.

After having elaborated this typology, the author tried to measure (through specially designed inventories, relevant inventories already in existence, and interviews) students' shifts along these lines. Their data show that a maturity syndrome does exist, and that college students do move in this direction. However, when he interprets the significance of this development, Heath departs seriously from what his data will support. His students seem to say that Haverford's small size, interaction with other students, chances to explore emotions, and the like caused their changes. But the author, in making two curricular recommendations, really suggests quite a rigid adherence to a somewhat disciplinary curriculum. Ideally, first class scholars are selected as faculty, and then demand excellent student performance in those things which interest the faculty. This style is generally applauded. The early portion of the book is a useful addition to the literature, but the curricular recommendations don't add much.

Another quantitative profile, prepared by **George W. Pierson,** is *The Education of American Leaders* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1969). The author attempts to discover the undergraduate background of successful people using various lists including signers of the Declaration of Independence, delegates to the Constitutional Convention, persons listed in the *Directory of American Biography* and *Who's Who in America,* and more recently published lists of achievements in fields such as business education and the arts. During the Constitutional period, fully two-thirds of the distinguished individuals had not attended college, whereas a large majority of those now alive who achieved distinction have gone to college.

Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and Columbia produced the most successful men, both in the earliest groups during the nineteenth century and in the last part of the twentieth century. Over the centuries, a few other institutions have joined these impressive schools, with Michigan, Pennsylvania, California, Chicago, and Cornell joining the group first and Wisconsin, MIT, Dartmouth, Minnesota, Illinois, New York University, and Stanford arriving somewhat later. There are obviously some differences among the professions, but the Harvard-Yale-Princeton triad outproduce even in those fields for which they do not maintain separate professional schools.

The book documents impressively the point that Haveman and West described in the early 1950's and Conant pointed out in the mid-1960's: the fact that a relatively small number of institutions produce the bulk of society's high-level leadership. Conant suggested that 20 universities and 20 colleges probably comprised this rather unchanging elite. He argued for recognition of this fact of life and the development of appropriate educational policy to perpetuate the system.

Pierson doesn't go that far explicitly, but the tone of his commentary suggests a leaning toward Conant's thesis. A summary of distinction in 15 fields provides this ranking of the big producers for the period 1865-1965: Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Columbia, Michigan, Pennsylvania, California, Chicago, Cornell, Wisconsin, MIT, Dartmouth, Minnesota, Illinois, New York University, Stanford, and Williams.

Arthur W. Chickering has written *Education and Identity* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969), which gained for him the American Council on Education's award for the best book of 1969. It is well worth that recognition. The author believes that an important, if not *the* most important, function of the educational institution is to help students learn to manage emotions, establish identity, become autonomous, have freer interpersonal relations, and develop integrity. Here some colleges have succeeded and some haven't; Chickering follows the earlier thesis that some institutions are peculiarly potent. But while some colleges make significant differences, generally all colleges make some difference. They amplify the differences between people who do and do not attend college, doing so through highly complex interaction of many different parts of the collegiate milieu. When he infers the directions in which collegiate reform might move, Chickering first suggests greater attention to that complexity, and then moves quickly into the orthodoxy of reform: increased direct experience, greater flexibility, varying time periods, teachers in new roles, small grouping, independent study, and the like.

Kenneth A. Feldman and **Theodore M. Newcomb** have made a major bibliographical contribution in *The Impact of College on Students,* Volume I (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969). They have summarized the enormous number of studies of the outcomes of college from the time of the publication of the Jacob Study in the 1950's to the present, and have given us a reasonably consistent picture based on empirical evidence.

There is consistent evidence that college students become less religious, that their values upon entering college tend to be reinforced if the college environment they select is consistent, and that they tend to drop out and go somewhere else if it isn't. Along certain intellectual lines, students do tend to change more significantly than do young people who do not attend college. An institution seems to attract students who are likely to be influenced by that particular sort of environment, and then reinforce those tendencies. Perhaps the least convincing series of bibliographic notes are those suggesting that changes intensified during the college year tend to persist. Father Andrew Greeley's studies of a carefully selected national sample refute this.

The authors refrain from arguing their rather well-known belief until the concluding chapter, where they do become somewhat doctrinaire in their all-out plea for institutional local autonomy and for autonomous subunits such as experimental colleges on a large university campus. As a companion piece, the authors present much of the data underlying their generalizations, which is most helpful. An equally helpful addition would have been a shorter, more interpretative essay somewhat in the style of the earlier Jacob volume. This summary is probably so long that only professional students of higher education will have time to read it; yet the findings should be brought to the attention of presidents, deans, and department heads. Possibly the authors will consider such a next step, as Nevitt Sanford did when he produced *Colleges and Character* after *The American College* proved somewhat heavy for administrators to carry around.

Teachers and Teaching

Robert Dubin and **Thomas C. Taveggia** have written *The Teaching-Learning Paradox* (Eugene: University of Oregon, 1968). They summarize three decades of research on teaching, and have synthesized both the conclusions of previous authors and their own data. They conclude that methods of teaching and class size make no demonstrable difference in students' achievement of goals measured. A number of writers, after demonstrating this to be true, still espoused a preferred style, but the evidence is so overpowering that the authors suggest that further research on methods per se would be fruitless. Rather, the whole set of research assumptions ought to be rearranged to find out more about college teaching.

It is at the point of suggesting new conceptualizations that the authors' treatment weakens seriously. It simply turns into an exhortation. "Nothing new will be discovered about college teaching methods until we ask new questions and seek their answers in research which departs significantly from that pursued in the past."

James W. Thornton, Jr. and **James W. Brown** have edited *New Media and College Teaching* (Washington: National Education Association, 1968). This is a sequel to the earlier *New Media in Higher Education;* both of these were outcomes of joint projects of the American Association for Higher Education and the Department of Audiovisual Instruction; both consist of case studies in institutions which have experimented with newer instructional devices, ranging from open or closed circuit television to computer-assisted or -based instruction. The study here combined questionnaires and field visits, with the editors collecting several thousand research reports or descriptive statements about uses of the media. Then after detailed assessment and evaluation, these information-filled chapters were prepared.

From their study, the authors concluded that applications of technology to higher education seemed to have been more adaptive than creative. Instruction materials to be used with the new media must be developed. The physical space institutions allow new media is woefully inadequate. If new media programs are to be effective, faculty development programs are essential, and there are some hopes that efforts and instructional time can be saved in the future through wise use of instructional media. The editors see that media experimentation is providing exciting breakthroughs toward improved instruction, but quite properly point out that the new media are not magic. They must be directed by humans, and their successes and failures will be fundamentally those of human beings.

The book includes some pictures of innovative devices; even more might have been appropriate. The institutional experiments are clearly described, and most of the elaborate claims that characterized vignettes in the earlier volume have been removed. Until this book is replaced, as it must be four or five years from now, it should be the starting point for anyone seeking to know the true state of the media art.

Wilbert J. McKeachie has written *Teaching Tips: A Guide for the Beginning College Teacher* (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath & Company, 1969), which reflects both the author's deep awareness of research on college teaching and his generally humane and commonsense approach to the problem of education. He generally accepts the college for what it is, accepting the validity of such things as courses, grades, lectures, course outlines, and readings. This book is intended to help the young teacher cope with reality, not reform the world. The presentation moves logically through selecting texts, first class meetings, logistical considerations, lecturing, discussion, laboratory projects, media-based instruction, papers, examinations, grades, problems of motivation, personalizing education, and ways of assessing one's own teaching. McKeachie feels that teaching is partly idiosyncratic, or at least based on the individual teacher's own personality, but that it can be improved by attending to such technical details as better lecture outlines, more carefully designed discussions, and using different sorts of materials for different purposes.

Quite a parochial book is **Hugh H. Skilling's** *Do You Teach?* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1969). It paraphrases a seminar on college teaching conducted for engineering graduate students at Stanford, and the remarks appear to have greatest significance for that institution. Each week the seminar director invited an outstanding individual from the Stanford campus to discuss his notions of teaching with these graduate students, and beyond doubt each person did have rich personal experience upon which to draw. Thus the provost, Frederick E. Terman, with a well-established reputation both as an engineer and builder of a university faculty, could advise—perhaps too glibly—on the significance of research for teaching and for establishing a salable reputation. Other speakers stressed such time-honored things as liking students, teaching what one knows well, attending to individual differences among students, preparing lectures carefully, using demonstrations or audiovisual aids when appropriate, and leading students to search for underlying principles.

As a commonsense aid for students and a major research-oriented university, these homiletics probably have some value; but for those preparing to teach in junior colleges or liberal arts colleges, they could be quite misleading. One chapter begins: "Professor Ralph Smith came cheerily into Room 308, and the bell rang as he closed the door behind him." This book, like most others dealing with teaching, makes the reader wonder why something generally judged as important as teaching always appears so dreary when it is described or portrayed in either scholarly or impressionistic terms.

Richard I. Evans has produced *Dialogue with Erik Erikson* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, Inc., 1969), which is one more of the series based on videotaped interviews with seminal thinkers in psychology and psychiatry. Evans is an insightful psychologist himself, hence is able to lead his interviewees to reveal their fundamental assumptions and to assess their own contributions to the overall development of psychological theory. The book is particularly important in the literature of higher education because Erikson's concepts have recently been given such wide attention by critics and theorists of college education, such as Joseph Katz and Nevitt Sanford.

Neil Postman and **Charles Weingartner** have written *Teaching as a Subversive Activity* (New York: Delacorte Press, 1969). While it really focuses on elementary and secondary school teaching, the insights could be of considerable value for college faculties, although they probably will not read the book. The authors show how arid for the lives of students are the sorts of curricula, text reading, classroom activities, and tests they experience. They point out that teachers rarely seek to determine what an individual student wants to know, preferring to teach him what the teacher thinks he should know.

Throughout this first critical section, the authors frequently use a medical analogy, arguing that it would be just as foolish for a doctor to prescribe penicillin for all illnesses merely because he is a penicillin specialist, as it is for a teacher to prescribe a particular poem or problem. In their more creative portions, the authors reveal considerable debt to Paul Goodman, Marshall McLuhan, and the general semanticists who were so popular in the early 1950's. They are trying to say that schools have tended to develop in students a belief that words have an objective reality, and have not taught them just how much of perception is generated within the individual. The critical parts of the book are insightful and interesting, and can stimulate reforming thoughts.

However, when the authors attempt to become operational, they fall into the same sort of trap which they see others in. For example, they ask, "How would such a teacher education program operate? In general something like this: It would shift the prospective teacher into the role of the inventor of viable teaching strategies." The semanticist could really have fun with that statement. They also fall into the trap which Paul Goodman probably led them to: by eliminating administration with authority, they would probably eliminate any sort of ordering of people into groups or along temporal sequences. While it is quite nice to say that each individual child has inside his skin certain needs and to the extent that education serves him, it serves him uniquely; the fact still must be faced that students are placed in large groups in elementary and secondary schools, and that some organization is necessary.

If a third writer had continuously stressed a more parsimonious view of the anticipated outcomes of education, the book would have been strengthened. For, in its present form, the book will clearly appeal to the already convinced, while the skeptics will discard it as one other "damned foolish" example of progressive education. More's the pity, for it really, in spite of the caveats, is a welcome addition.

Bibliographies and Guides

Thomas J. Diener and **David L. Trower** have edited *An Annotated Guide to Periodical Literature—Higher Education* (Athens: Institute of Higher Education, 1969), a most useful device for graduate students and run-of-the-mill administrators who don't know the scope of the periodical literature. The Guide annotates 96 periodicals; annotations are descriptive, not evaluative. Most of the standard works are included, but the bibliography would have been more valuable had the editors gone just slightly farther afield to include such things as the *Journal of Urban Affairs, Transaction,* or *Psychology Today,* all of which contain a substantial quantity of material directly germane to higher education.

Another volume in the series produced under the auspices of the Carnegie Commission on the future of higher education is **Dale M. Heckman** and **Warren Bryan Martin's** *Inventory of Current Research on Higher Education, 1968* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969). This is a compendium of research either recently completed or in process, obtained by a thorough search of literature as well as by sending questionnaires to individuals active in and knowledgeable about research in higher education. The annotations are descriptive rather than evaluative, so the user will need to be quite careful in selecting from the richness ostensibly contained in the document.

The authors have tried to classify research under such headings as structures, students, and programs. Cross-classification according to research methodology used, or at least the degree of rigor actually exercised, would also have been helpful. The way the monograph now stands, almost casual interview studies on randomly picked colleges are juxtaposed with carefully structured experiments. However, at present this is the most complete and most useful abstract available, and is far superior to the abstracting that emanates from the various ERIC centers. The questionnaire approach has been able to unearth many important studies that the ERIC centers just have not tapped.

A book that should have been much better than it is is editors **Lee J. Cronbach** and **Patrick Suppe's** *Research for Tomorrow's Schools* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1969). This is the first publication effort of the recently established National Academy of Education, and purports to be a progress report on the state of educational research in the United States.

The editors see three distinct periods of research. There was the last half of the nineteenth century, when several new journals were founded and the Bureau of Education began to collect statistics upon which judgments about education could be based. Then followed the heyday of empiricism, roughly from 1895 to 1938, when Dewey, Cubberley, Terman, and others made their contributions, all of which tended to revolutionize the practice of education. From 1938 onward, the editors see a decline in disciplined inquiry and an increase in promotional activity and polemical writing. During this period, research came to be regarded as an agent of change rather than as a device to establish new facts and theories. Now, the editors believe that the educational climate is such that educational research can flower again if some of their values are generally accepted. These include greater federal support for research, better preparation of research workers, and attracting the research interests of scholars in appropriate disciplines. If their reforms are adopted, a number of researchable problems should be assigned high priority, ranging from studies of the patterns and causes of teacher mobility to philosophical analysis of contents of justice and equality, which are latent in the nation's educational policy.

This work's principal theoretical contribution is the substitution of conclusion and decision-oriented studies for the previous almost meaningless distinction between basic or pure and applied research. Its weakest portion is the failure of the editors to apply the same criticisms they leveled at Dewey's contribution in the Laboratory School in Chicago to their own beliefs about research's potential contributions for the future. They point out that Dewey was much more interested in demonstrating what could be done with his school than concerned with firmly established empirical findings. But the editors don't really show how the empirically based studies they envision for the future will improve educational practice. A minor weakness is the quite casual treatment given to higher education research; only one little-known study is used to support their generalizations.

As a brief, reasonably well-written overview of the history of educational research to introduce graduate students to the subject, the book is quite useful. As a broad policy document which could contribute to future guidelines for national research effort, the coverage is too brief, the policy requirements too glib, and the criticisms of such things as research and development centers too mild.

Lindley J. Stiles has written *Introduction to Education* (G. P. Putnam Sons, 1969), intending the book to be a guidance work for high school students. But neither the text nor the format seems particularly likely to encourage students to go into education, or even to read the book, which is a blend of accepted pedagoguese and Utopian dreaming about education. Thus the author sees preparation for teaching as not only vocationally-oriented but as good preparation for a wide range of other vocations and callings. He believes that aptitude or interest tests should show prospective teachers to be primarily interested in the achievement of others, to prefer doing to thinking, to like to work with others, to believe that education has been ineffective in the past, and to believe that a job is essentially a form of personal fulfillment. After too many pages of such material, the book delves into some of the fields appropriate to professional education and some of the broad issues concerning education which are discussed by academicians. The book would be more useful as collateral reading for a freshman or sophomore college course on the introduction to teaching, where it would be read because it was required.

Albert B. Hood wrote *What Type of College for What Type of Student?* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1968), which reports on an elaborate questionnaire survey of all Minnesota high school graduates. The study compared certain elements of academic aptitude, personality predisposition, socioeconomic background and the like with the sort of college within the state these students attended and how successful they were. Most of the study's findings should emphasize just how complex the college-attending process really is. All college student bodies are quite heterogeneous. However, one institution's low-aptitude students are higher than another school's high. All institutions seem to represent a wide range of socioeconomic backgrounds. While certain personality characteristics seem to be related to collegiate achievement, the relationships operate no matter what institution the student attends, suggesting that there is no such thing as an ideal institution for a certain personality.

The most significant finding of the entire study is the arbitrariness of grades and their lack of relationship to academic aptitude. Colleges do develop distinctive grading patterns which are difficult to change and which probably affect their students adversely and unfairly. Thus an institution may increase its selectivity but retain a fixed grading standard, with the result that students attending that institution and earning low grades would very likely earn high grades at another institution. When this is compared with other cited evidence about the lack of relationship between grades and subsequent achievement, and when it is noted that graduate schools rely more and more on grades to select their students, it becomes obvious that a highly capricious condition exists. This is number 14 in the very valuable series of Minnesota studies in student personnel work.

Bert D. Anderson has written *Introduction to College* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969), a reasonably adequate and reasonably well-written counseling or guidance document for the young person contemplating college. After giving a brief historical overview of American higher education and equally brief characterizations of different sorts of colleges, the author discusses how to concentrate, how to improve reading ability, how to develop motivation, how to use the library, and how to cope with frustration. Since there really is a little empirical information on these topics, the book relies overmuch on folkways and common sense. Thus, to claim that the college library is an ideal place for study since it is quiet and the atmosphere is conducive to work might or might not be a tenable position. But the homilies probably won't hurt prospective college students, so they might use the book and some desirable changes might occur.

Sam F. Trelease has written *How to Write Scientific and Technical Papers* (Cambridge: The Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1969). This is a well prepared, readable style book which will be quite appropriate for graduate students. It seems better than most such handbooks and can be well recommended.

A large, costly, and confusing reference tool is **Karen C. Hegner's** *Annual Guide to Graduate Study* (Princeton: Peterson's Guides Incorporated, 1969). Ostensibly it is intended to help prospective graduate students choose a school. However, the editor does not indicate why some institutions are included and others not. Thus, for graduate study in education, Harvard and Stanford are included, but the equally productive University of Chicago and the University of Illinois are not. In the physical sciences Wesleyan is included, although its student body's science propensity resembles more closely that of students at Eastern women's colleges than that of other Ivy League students. Under business, Babson Institute is described, but the graduate schools of business at Harvard and at Stanford—surely of some possible interest to prospective candidates—are not. A casual leafing through the programs described in science and art suggest that many more of the small producers of Ph.D.'s are described than is true of the big producers.

Generally, one page is devoted to each institution. Programs are listed linearly rather than in easier-to-read column format. The comments are strictly factual and deal not at all with qualitative differences. For example, it might have helped to have used Cartter's ranking of graduate institutions. Unless this reviewer has missed something significant, it is difficult to justify the fifty-some-odd dollars which this heavily bound, ponderous compendium costs. *American Graduate School,* put out by Viking Press, seems much more effective, as does the *Cowles Guide to Graduate Schools.*

Rodney T. Hartnett has produced *College and University Trustees: Their Backgrounds, Roles, and Educational Attitudes* (Princeton: Educational Testing Services, 1969). This presents the results of a questionnaire study of 5000 board members from over 500 colleges and universities, sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

It gives a profile of American trustees, and reveals very few surprises. Board members are typically in their late '50's or older, white, reasonably comfortable financially, and male. They tend to be substantially more conservative about such things as academic freedom than do faculties. They apparently don't spend a great deal of time on trustee work, nor do they read much of direct relevance to higher education. The report etches in considerable detail the criticism which students have made that college policies are made by one important subculture of the society, but that these affect most directly a completely different subculture having no real voice in the enterprise in which they may find themselves.

Received but Unreviewed

Because so many books about higher education have been produced recently, not all could be reviewed critically. Some items which fall into this category were simply produced too late in the year, while others seemed only tangential or peripheral to the central thrust of this annual essay. And several, although of potential considerable significance, escaped critical reading just because of sheer lack of time.

Claude T. Bissell, *The Strength of the University* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968). A collection of the speeches and essays of a leading Canadian college president.

Kenneth A. Feldman and **Theodore M. Newcomb,** *The Impact of College on Students, Volume II* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969). This book contains actual data supporting generalizations contained in Volume I.

John Barnard, *From Evangelism to Progressivism at Oberlin College, 1866-1917* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1969). An institutional history of Oberlin during a critical half decade which reflects the power of student effort and need to bring about constitutional change.

The Future of the Humanities. Daedalus, Summer 1969. This issue presents a series of papers and discussion trying to establish the appropriate and the present role of the humanities in the nation's intellectual life.

Raymond Poignant, *Education and Development* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1969). An effort to compare education in Western Europe, the United States, and the U.S.S.R., considering primary and secondary education, technical education, higher education, and the economics of education.

Earl J. McGrath and **Jack T. Johnson,** *The Changing Mission of Home Economics* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1968). One more publication of the Institute of Higher Education which ends up with a look to the future of home economics.

Cyril C. Ling and **Eunice K. Lange,** *The Next Half Century in Higher Education for Business* (St. Louis: American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business, 1969). The Proceedings of the Fiftieth annual meeting, presenting case materials of new developments in a number of graduate schools of business.

Internationalizing the U.S. Professional School (New York: Education and World Affairs, 1969). This book includes papers presented at a 1968 Conference on Education and World Affairs. Authors of the papers are generally considered quite knowledgeable.

Accredited Institutions of Higher Education 1969-1970 (Washington: American Council on Education, 1969). A standard periodical directory with institutions listed alphabetically by states.

John W. Leslie, *Focus on Understanding and Support: A Study in College Management* (Washington: American College Public Relations Association, 1969). Results and implications of a questionnaire study of college fund raising and developing programs and the role of public relations.

Louis A. D'Amico and **William D. Brook,** *The Spatial Campus* (Bloomington: School of Education, Indiana University, 1968). A planning scheme with selected and annotated bibliography.

The Mathematical Sciences Undergraduate Education (Washington: National Academy of Sciences, 1968). A report on proposals and recommendations for changes in mathematics education, and a résumé of changes accomplished over a 25-year period.

Frederick G. Knirk and **John W. Childs,** *Instructional Technology* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968). Relatively brief essays covering most areas of the new media.

Richard J. Walter, *Student Politics in Argentina: The University Reform and Its Effects, 1918-1964* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968).

In Honor of Dean and Mrs. Edmund G. Williamson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1969). Bibliography of Dean Williamson and several interpretative essays placing his contributions to the student personnel movement in historical context.

Ossian MacKenzie, *Correspondence Instruction in the United States* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969). Brief history and profile of present efforts in correspondence education.

Malcolm S. Knowles, *Higher Adult Education in the United States* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1969). A survey of the current scene and an indication of current trends and issues.

Robert T. Alciatore and **Ruth E. Eckert,** *Minnesota Ph.D.'s Evaluate Their Teaching* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1969). A study of the relationship of the various Ph.D. programs to later career service and satisfaction.

Robert N. Taylor, Jr., *This Damned Campus* (Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press, 1969). Reflections on the campus scene by a campus chaplain, designed as a kind of guidance document.

Arnold J. Toynbee, *Higher Education in a Time of Acceleration Change* (New York: Academy for Educational Development, 1969). Brief interpretative essay stimulated by the author's reading of *Campus 1980,* edited by Alvin C. Eurich.

William Taylor, editor, *Towards a Policy for the Education of Teachers* (London: Archon Books, 1969). The proceedings of a 1968 conference on an English research society which examines the role of government, the processes of teacher preparation, and the relationship of government, universities, and the teaching profession for the preparation of new members.

William A. Hoppe, *Policies and Practices in Evening Colleges, 1969* (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1969). Reports on a survey of more than a hundred evening colleges and divisions under the auspices of the Research Committee of the Association of University Evening Colleges.

Dael Wolfle, *The Discovery of Talent* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969). A series of essays by psychologists who have studied talent over the past 25 years.

F. Robert Paulsen, editor, *Changing Dimensions in International Education* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1969). Papers presented in 1966-67 in one of the Colloquium Series of the College of Education at the University of Arizona.

William F. O'Neill, *Selected Educational Heresies* (Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Company, 1969). Carefully selected examples of writings from contemporary educational reform writers.

John H. McCord, editor, *With All Deliberate Speed: Civil Rights Theory and Reality* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1969). Well-developed long initial essay on the actual legal history of civil rights decisions, followed by interpretative essays dealing with specific aspects of the civil rights struggle.

John J. Sullivan, *Potential: The Academically Able But Disadvantaged High School Student* (Athens: Institute of Higher Education, 1969). Brief résumé of the problem and suggested remedies.

Galen N. Drewry and **Thomas J. Diener,** *Effective Academic Administration: A Team Approach* (Athens: Institute of Higher Education, 1969). Brief description of the academic team and suggestions for functioning.

Bill D. Feltner, *The Administrative Team: Relationships to Internal and External Groups* (Athens: Institute of Higher Education, 1968). Selected papers from a conference on the administrative team.

John D. Millett, *Reconstruction of the University* (Cincinnati: Institute for Research and Training in Higher Education, 1968). Two essays developing a rationale for improved administration of collegiate institutions.

James C. Stone, *Teachers for the Disadvantaged* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969). A résumé of outcomes of several federally supported programs and suggestions for the future.

Philip Runkel et al., *The Changing College Classroom* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969). A collection of descriptions of actual teaching practice in a number of institutions. All practices are presumed to be atypical and more effective than orthodox methods.

James W. Brown, Richard B. Lewis, and **Fred F. Harcleroad,** *A.V. Instruction: Media and Methods* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969). Well-illustrated résumé of the various audiovisual materials available and sources for materials that can be used. Concentrates more on materials for the lower grades than on higher education.

Calvin P. Blair, *Responsibilities of the Foreign Scholar to the Local Scholarly Community* (New York: Education and World Affairs, 1969). Case studies of U.S. involvement in Guatemala, Chile, and Paraguay.

John Egerton, *State Universities and Black Americans* (Atlanta: Southern Education Reporting Service, 1969). An inquiry into desegregation and equity for Negroes in 100 public institutions, presenting a generally pessimistic prognosis.

Lawrence Handel, *College Confidential* (New York: Trident Press, 1969). Hardbacked guidance book presumably prepared on the basis of information provided by students at selected colleges and universities.

Daedalus, Fall 1969. The substance of several different conferences sponsored by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, most of which deal directly with the problems of governance in universities.

INDEX OF AUTHORS AND TITLES

Accredited Institutions of Higher Education 1969-70, 68

Administrative Team: Relationships to Internal and External Groups, The, Bill D. Feltner, 70

Agony and Promise, G. Kerry Smith (ed.), 8

Alciatore, Robert T., and Ruth E. Eckert, *Minnesota Ph.D's Evaluate Their Teaching,* 69

Alternative Methods of Federal Funding for Higher Education, Ronald A. Wolk, 38

Altman, Robert A., *A Study of the Establishment of Upper Division Colleges in the United States,* 42

American University: How It Runs, Where It Is Going, The, Jacques Barzun, 3

Anarchy and Culture: The Problem of the Contemporary University, David Martin (ed.), 25

Anderson, Bert D., *Introduction to College,* 66

Annotated Guide to Periodical Literature—Higher Education, An, Thomas J. Diener and David L. Trower (eds.), 64

Annual Guide to Graduate Study, Karen C. Hegner, 66

Approaches to Education for Character, Clarence H. Faust and Jessica Feingold (eds.), 57

Aron, Raymond, *The Elusive Revolution: Anatomy of a Student Revolt,* 27

Art and Education, Michael Steveni, 21

Arts and Education, The, 20

Arts in Higher Education, The, Lawrence Dennis and Renate M. Jacob (eds.), 19

Astin, Alexander W., and Robert J. Panos, *The Educational and Vocational Development of College Students,* 30

A.V. Instruction: Media and Methods, James W. Brown, Richard B. Lewis, and Fred F. Harcleroad, 70

Axelrod, Joseph, *et al., Search for Relevance: The Campus in Crisis,* 3

Baker, Michael A., *et al., The Police on the Campus,* 29

Bareither, Harlan D., and Jerry L. Schillinger, *University Space Planning,* 41

Barnard, John, *From Evangelism to Progressivism at Oberlin College, 1866-1917,* 68

Barzun, Jacques, *The American University: How It Runs, Where It Is Going,* 3

Bassett, Richard, *The Open Eye in Learning: The Role of Art in General Education,* 20

Bell, Daniel, and Irving Kristol (eds.), *Confrontation: The Student Rebellion at the Universities,* 26

Benefit Plans in American Colleges, William C. Greenough and Francis P. King, 35

Better the Dream, William B. Faherty, S.J., 49

Birenbaum, William M., *Overlive: Power, Poverty, and the University,* 7

Bissell, Claude T., *The Strength of the University,* 68

The Black College, Tilden J. and Wilbert J. LeMelle, 48

Black Power and Student Rebellion, James McEvoy and Abraham Miller (eds.), 24

Black Studies at the University: A Symposium, Armstead L. Robinson *et al.* (eds.), 21

Blair, Calvin P., *Responsibilities of the Foreign Scholar to the Local Scholarly Community,* 70

Bloland, Harland G., *Higher Education Associations in a Decentralized Education System,* 40

Blum, Richard H., and associates, *Students and Drugs,* 56

Brawer, Florence B., and Arthur M. Cohen, *Measuring Faculty Performance,* 46

Breakthrough in Teacher Education, James C. Stone, 53

Brewster, Kingman, *et al., Educating for the Twenty-First Century,* 5

Brick, Michael, and Earl J. McGrath, *Innovation in the Liberal Arts Colleges,* 15

Brook, William D., and Louis A. D'Amico, *The Spatial Campus,* 69

Brown, David G., *Faculty Recruitment,* 45

Brown, J. Douglas, *The Liberal University: An Institutional Analysis,* 39

Brown, James W., Richard B. Lewis, and Fred F. Harcleroad, *A.V. Instruction: Media and Methods,* 70

Brown, James W., and James W. Thornton, Jr. (eds.), *New Media and College Teaching,* 61

Budig, Gene A., *Governors and Higher Education,* 44

Bullock, Henry Allen, *A History of Negro Education in the South,* 49

Caffrey, John (ed.), *The Future Academic Community: Continuity and Change,* 11

Campus Apocalypse, Donald L. Rogan, 27

Cantelon, John E., *College Education and the Campus Revolution,* 50

Careers of Ph.D's: Academic Versus Non-Academic, National Academy of Sciences, 58

Centennial Lectures, 1968-1969, 11

Changing College Classroom, The, Philip Runkel *et al.*, 70

Changing Dimensions in International Education, F. Robert Paulsen (ed.), 70

Changing Mission of Home Economics, The, Earl J. McGrath and Jack T. Johnson, 68

Chickering, Arthur W., *Education and Identity,* 59

Childs, John W., and Frederick G. Knirk, *Instructional Technology,* 69

Christenson, Gordon A. (ed.), *The Future of the University,* 55

Cogan, Lee, *Negroes for Medicine,* 31

Cohen, Arthur M., *Dateline '79: Heretical Concepts for the Community College,* 54

Cohen, Arthur M., and Florence B. Brawer, *Measuring Faculty Performance,* 46

Cole, Steven, *The Unionization of Teachers,* 33

College and University Trustees: Their Backgrounds, Roles, and Educational Attitudes, Rodney T. Hartnett, 69

College Confidential, Lawrence Handel, 70

College Curriculum and Student Protest, Joseph J. Schwab, 18

College Education and the Campus Revolution, John E. Cantelon, 50

Colleges and Universities as Agents of Social Change, W. John Minter and Ian M. Thomson (eds.), 9

Colleges Today and Tomorrow, Lewis B. Mayhew, 13

Conflict of Generations, The, Lewis S. Feuer, 23

Conformity, Warren Bryan Martin, 13

Confrontation: The Student Rebellion at the Universities, Daniel Bell and Irving Kristol (eds.), 26

Construction of an American College, The, Warren I. Susman, 54

Contemporary College Students and the Curriculum, Lewis B. Mayhew, 17

Correspondence Instruction in the United States, Ossian MacKenzie, 69

Covert, James T., and Louis C. Vaccaro (eds.), *Student Freedom in American Higher Education,* 26

Cross Currents in College Admissions, Humphrey Dohrman, 35

Cronbach, Lee J., and Patrick Suppes (eds.), *Research for Tomorrow's Schools,* 64

Culture of the University, Governance and Education, The, Cabel Foote, Henry Mayer, and associates, 33

Cuyler, Cornelius M. (ed.), *The Identity of the Minor Seminary: What Is Its Future?* 52

Daedalus, Fall 1969, 70

D'Amico, Louis A., and William D. Brook, *The Spatial Campus,* 69

Dateline '79: Heretical Concepts for the Community College, Arthur M. Cohen, 54

Decision Making and Administration in Higher Education, John D. Millett, 43

Delisle, Frances H., and Paul L. Dressel, *Undergraduate Curriculum Trends,* 19

Dennis, Lawrence, and Renate M. Jacob (eds.), *The Arts in Higher Education,* 19

Dialogue with Erik Erikson, Richard I. Evans, 62

Diebold, John, *Man and the Computer,* 38

Diener, Thomas J., and Galen N. Drewry, *Effective Academic Administration: A Team Approach,* 70

Diener, Thomas J., and David L. Trower (eds.), *An Annotated Guide to Periodical Literature—Higher Education,* 64

Dimensions of Academic Freedom, Walter P. Medsker *et al.* (eds.), 36

Discovery of Talent, The, Dael Wolfle, 69

Do You Teach? Hugh H. Skilling, 62

Dohrman, Humphrey, *Cross Currents in College Admissions,* 35

Dressel, Paul L., and Frances H. Delisle, *Undergraduate Curriculum Trends,* 19

Drewry, Galen N., and Thomas J. Diener, *Effective Academic Administration: A Team Approach,* 70

Drug Abuse: Escape to Nowhere, 56

Drugs from A to Z: A Dictionary, Richard R. Lingeman, 57

Drugs on the College Campus, Helen H. Nowlis, 57

Dubin, Robert, and Thomas C. Taveggia, *The Teaching-Learning Paradox,* 61

Dynamics of Academic Reform, JB Lon Hefferlin, 18

Eckert, Ruth E., and Robert T. Alciatore, *Minnesota Ph.D's Evaluate Their Teaching,* 69

Educating for the Twenty-First Century, Kingman Brewster *et al.*, 5

Education and the Business Dollar, Kenneth G. Patrick and Richard Eells, 39

Education and Development, Raymond Poignant, 68

Education and Identity, Arthur W. Chickering, 59

Education in the States: Nationwide Development Since 1900, Edgar Fuller and Jim B. Pearson (eds.), 12

Education Industry, The, W. Kenneth Richmond, 41

Education of American Leaders, The, George W. Pierson, 58

Educational and Vocational Development of College Students, The, Alexander W. Astin and Robert J. Panos, 30

Eells, Richard, and Kenneth G. Patrick, *Education and the Business Dollar,* 39

Effective Academic Administration: A Team Approach, Galen N. Drewry and Thomas J. Diener, 70

Egerton, John, *State Universities and Black Americans,* 70

Ehrenreich, Barbara and John, *Long March, Short Spring: A Modern Reader,* 29

Elusive Revolution: Anatomy of a Student Revolt, The, Raymond Aron, 27

Epstein, Nathan B., and William A. Westley, *Silent Majority,* 30

Eurich, Alvin C., *Reforming American Education,* 4

Evans, Richard I., *Dialogue with Erik Erikson,* 62

Experiment at Berkeley, Joseph Tussman, 17

Faculty Recruitment, David G. Brown, 45

Faherty, William B., S.J., *Better the Dream,* 49

Faust, Clarence H., and Jessica Feingold (eds.), *Approaches to Education for Character,* 57

Feingold, Jessica, and Clarence H. Faust (eds.), *Approaches to Education for Character,* 57

Feldman, Kenneth A., and Theodore M. Newcomb, *The Impact of College on Students, Volume I,* 59

Feldman, Kenneth A., and Theodore M. Newcomb, *The Impact of College on Students, Volume II,* 68

Feltner, Bill D., *The Administrative Team: Relationships to Internal and External Groups,* 70

Feuer, Lewis S., *The Conflict of Generations,* 23

Findikyan, Nurhan, and Warren W. Willingham, *Patterns of Admission for Transfer Students,* 42

First, Wesley W. (ed.) *University on the Heights,* 52

Five College Cooperation: Report of the Five College Long-Range Planning Committee, 1969, 34

Fletcher, Basil, *Universities in the Modern World,* 10

Focus on Understanding and Support: A Study in College Management, John W. Leslie, 69

Foote, Cabel, Henry Mayer, and associates, *The Culture of the University, Governance and Education,* 33

From Evangelism to Progressivism at Oberlin College, 1866-1917, John Barnard, 68

Fuller, Edgar, and Jim B. Pearson (eds.), *Education in the States: Nationwide Development Since 1900,* 12

Future Academic Community: Continuity and Change, The, John Caffrey (ed.), 11

Future of the University, The, Gordon A. Christenson (ed.), 55

Gordon, Oakley J., *Profess or Perish,* 45

Government in the American Unisity, John D. Millett, 42

Governors and Higher Education, Gene A. Budig, 44

Grand Valley State College: Its Developmental Years, 1964-1968, James H. Sumberge, 52

Greenough, William C., and Francis P. King, *Benefit Plans in American Colleges,* 35

Growing Up in College, Douglas H. Heath, 58

Guide to Academic Protocol, A, Mary Kemper Gunn, 44

Gunn, Mary Kemper, *A Guide to Academic Protocol,* 44

Handel, Lawrence, *College Confidential,* 70

Harcleroad, Fred F., James W. Brown, and Richard B. Lewis, *A.V. Instruction: Media and Methods,* 70

Hartnett, Rodney T., *College and University Trustees: Their Backgrounds, Roles, and Educational Attitudes,* 67

Heath, Douglas H., *Growing Up in College,* 58

Heckman, Dale M., and Warren Bryan Martin, *Inventory of Current Research on Higher Education, 1968,* 64

Hefferlin, JB Lon, *Dynamics of Academic Reform,* 18

Hegner, Karen C., *Annual Guide to Graduate Study,* 66

Higher Adult Education in the United States, Malcolm S. Knowles, 69

Higher Education Associations in a Decentralized Education System, Harland G. Bloland, 40

Higher Education in a Time of Acceleration Change, Arnold J. Toynbee, 69

Higher Learning: The Universities and the Public, The, Carl Kaysen, 6

Hilberry, Conrad, and Morris Keeton, *Struggle and Promise: A Future for Colleges,* 47

Hirsch, Walter (ed.) *Inventing Education for the Future,* 10

History of Negro Education in the South, A, Henry Allen Bullock, 49

Hood, Albert B., *What Type of College for What Type of Student?* 65

Hoppe, William A., *Policies and Practices in Evening Colleges,* 69

How to Write Scientific and Technical Papers, Sam F. Trelease, 66

Howell, Joel, *So You're Going to be a Dean of Men,* 45

Identity of the Minor Seminary: What Is Its Future? The, Cornelius M. Cuyler, 52

Impact of College on Students, The, Volume I, Kenneth A. Feldman and Theodore M. Newcomb, 59

Impact of College on Students, The, Volume II, Kenneth A. Feldman and Theodore M. Newcomb, 68

Innovation in the Liberal Arts Colleges, Michael Brick and Earl J. McGrath, 15

Institutions of Intelligence, Bertram Morris, 6

Instructional Technology, Frederick G. Knirk and John W. Childs, 69

Internationalizing the U.S. Professional School, 68

Introduction to College, Bert D. Anderson, 66

Introduction to Education, Lindley J. Stiles, 65

Introductory Papers on Institutional Research, 43

Inventing Education for the Future, Walter Hirsch (ed.), 10

Inventory of Current Research on Higher Education, 1968, Dale M. Heckman and Warren Bryan Martin, 64

Islands of Innovation Expanding, B. Lamar Johnson, 15

Jacob, Renate M., and Lawrence Dennis (eds.), *The Arts in Higher Education,* 19

Johnson, B. Lamar, *Islands of Innovation Expanding,* 15

Johnson, Jack T., and Earl J. McGrath, *The Changing Mission of Home Economics,* 68

Kaysen, Carl, *The Higher Learning: The Universities and the Public,* 6

Keeton, Morris, and Conrad Hilberry, *Struggle and Promise: A Future for Colleges,* 47

King, Francis P., and William C. Greenough, *Benefit Plans in American Colleges,* 35

Knirk, Frederick G., and John W. Childs, *Instructional Technology,* 69

Knowles, Malcolm S., *Higher Adult Education in the United States,* 69

Kristol, Irving and Daniel Bell (eds.), *Confrontation: The Student Rebellion at the Universities,* 26

Kunen, James Simon, *The Strawberry Statement,* 28

Lange, Eunice K., and Cyril C. Ling, *The Next Half Century in Higher Education for Business,* 68

Leadership in Higher Education, 44

Lecht, Leonard A., *Manpower Needs for National Goals in the Nineteen Seventies,* 9

Legal Aspects of Student Discipline in Higher Education, The, D. Parker Young, 43

LeMelle, Tilden J., and Wilbert J., *The Black College,* 48

Leslie, John W., *Focus on Under-Standing and Support: A Study in College Management,* 69

Letter, Sidney S. (ed.), *New Prospects for the Small Liberal Arts College,* 51

Levi, Julian H., and Fred S. Vorsanger, *Patterns of Giving to Higher Education,* 41

Lewis, Richard B., James W. Brown, and Fred F. Harcleroad, *A.V. Instruction: Media and Methods,* 70

Liberal University: An Institutional Analysis, The, J. Douglas Brown, 39

Ling, Cyril C., and Eunice K. Lange, *The Next Half Century in Higher Education for Business,* 68

Lingeman, Richard R., *Drugs from A to Z: A Dictionary,* 57

Long March, Short Spring: A Modern Reader, Barbara and John Ehrenreich, 29

MacKenzie, Ossian, *Correspondence Instruction in the United States,* 69

Man and the Computer, John Diebold, 38

Man in Perspective, Dyckman W. Vermilye (ed.), 11

Manpower Needs for National Goals in the Nineteen Seventies, Leonard A. Lecht, 9

Martin, David (ed.), *Anarchy and Culture: The Problem of the Contemporary University,* 25

Martin, Warren Bryan, *Conformity,* 13

Martin, Warren Bryan, and Dale M. Heckman, *Inventory of Current Research on Higher Education, 1968,* 64

Mathematical Sciences, The, 22

Mathematical Sciences Undergraduate Education, The, 69

Mayer, Henry, Cabel Foote, and associates, *The Culture of the University, Governance and Education,* 33

Mayhew, Lewis B., *Colleges Today and Tomorrow,* 13

Mayhew, Lewis B., *Contemporary College Students and the Curriculum,* 17

McCord, John H. (ed.) *With All Deliberate Speed: Civil Rights Theory and Reality,* 70

McEvoy, James, and Abraham Miller (eds.), *Black Power and Student Rebellion,* 24

McGrath, Earl J., and Michael Brick, *Innovation in the Liberal Arts Colleges,* 15

McGrath, Earl J., and Jack T. Johnson, *The Changing Mission of Home Economics,* 68

McKeachie, Wilbert J., *Memo to New Department Chairmen,* 45

McKeachie, Wilbert J., *Teaching Tips: A Guide for the Beginning College Teacher,* 62

Measuring Faculty Performance, Arthur M. Cohen and Florence B. Brawer, 46

Medsker, Walter P., *et al.* (eds.), *Dimensions of Academic Freedom,* 36

Memo to New Department Chairmen, Wilbert J. MacKeachie, 45

Miller, Abraham, and James McEvoy (eds.), *Black Power and Student Rebellion,* 24

Millett, John D., *Decision Making and Administration in Higher Education,* 43

Millett, John D., *Government in the American University,* 42

Millett, John D., *Reconstruction of the University,* 70

Minnesota Ph.D's Evaluate Their Teaching, Robert T. Alciatore and Ruth E. Eckert, 69

Minter, W. John, and Ian M. Thomson (eds.), *Colleges and Universities as Agents of Social Change,* 9

Mock, Kathleen R., and George Yonge, *Students' Intellectual Attitudes, Aptitudes and Persistence,* 31

Morris, Bertram, *Institutions of Intelligence,* 6

National Academy of Sciences, *Careers of Ph.D's: Academic Versus Non-Academic,* 58

Negroes for Medicine, Lee Cogan, 31

New Approach to Academic Administration, A, Ellis L. Phillips, Jr., 35

New Media and College Teaching, James W. Thornton, Jr., and James W. Brown, 61

New Prospects for the Small Liberal Arts College, Sidney S. Letter (ed.), 51

Newcomb, Theodore M., and Kenneth A. Feldman, *The Impact of College on Students, Volume I,* 59

Newcomb, Theodore M., and Kenneth A. Feldman, *The Impact of College on Students, Volume II,* 68

Next Half Century in Higher Education for Business, The, Cyril C. Ling and Eunice Lange, 68

Nowlis, Helen H., *Drugs on the College Campus,* 57

O'Neill, William F., *Selected Educational Heresies,* 70

Open Eye in Learning: The Role of Art in General Education, The, Richard Bassett, 20

Overlive: Power, Poverty, and the University, William M. Birenbaum, 7

Panos, Robert J., and Alexander W. Astin, *The Educational and Vocational Development of College Students,* 30

Paradox, Process and Progress, Ronald W. Roskens and Robert I. White (eds.), 8

Patrick, Kenneth G., and Richard Eells, *Education and the Business Dollar,* 39

Patterns of Admission for Transfer Students, Warren W. Willingham and Nurhan Findikyan, 42

Patterns of Giving to Higher Education, Julian H. Levi and Fred S. Vorsanger, 41

Paulsen, F. Robert (ed.), *Changing Dimensions in International Education,* 70

Pearson, Jim B., and Edgar Fuller (eds.), *Education in the States: Nationwide Development Since 1900,* 12

Phillips, Ellis L., Jr., *A New Approach to Academic Administration,* 35

Pierson, George W., *The Education of American Leaders,* 58

Poignant, Raymond, *Education and Development,* 68

Police on the Campus, The, Michael A. Baker *et al.,* 29

Policies and Practices in Evening Colleges, William A. Hoppe, 69

Postman, Neil, and Charles Weingartner, *Teaching as a Subversive Activity,* 63

Potential: The Academically Able But Disadvantaged High School Student, John J. Sullivan, 70

Profess or Perish, Oakley J. Gordon, 45

Rauh, Morton A., *The Trusteeship of Colleges and Universities,* 37

Reconstruction of the University, John D. Millett, 70

Reforming American Education, Alvin C. Eurich, 4

Research for Tomorrow's Schools, Lee J. Cronbach and Patrick Suppes (eds.), 64

Responsibilities of the Foreign Scholar to the Local Scholarly Community, Calvin P. Blair, 70

Richmond, W. Kenneth, *The Education Industry,* 41

Robinson, Armstead L., *et al.* (eds.), *Black Studies at the University: A Symposium,* 21

Rogan, Donald L., *Campus Apocalypse,* 27

Roskens, Ronald W., and Robert I. White (eds.), *Paradox, Process and Progress,* 8

Runkel, Philip, *et al., The Changing College Classroom,* 70

Schillinger, Jerry L., and Harlan D. Bareither, *University Space Planning,* 41

Schwab, Joseph J., *College Curriculum and Student Protest,* 18

Search for Relevance: The Campus in Crisis, Joseph Axelrod *et al.,* 3

Selected Educational Heresies, William F. O'Neill, 70

Silent Majority, William A. Westley and Nathan B. Epstein, 30

Skilling, Hugh H., *Do You Teach?* 62

Smith, G. Kerry (ed.), *Agony and Promise,* 8

So You're Going to Be a Dean of Men, Joel Howell, 45

Spatial Campus, The, Louis A. D'Amico and William D. Brook, 69

State Universities and Black Americans, John Egerton, 70

Steveni, Michael, *Art and Education,* 21

Stiles, Lindley J., *Introduction to Education,* 65

Stone, James C., *Breakthrough in Teacher Education,* 53

Stone, James C., *Teachers for the Disadvantaged,* 70

Strawberry Statement, The, James Simon Kunen, 28

Strength of the University, The, Claude T. Bissell, 68

Struggle and Promise: A Future for Colleges, Morris Keeton and Conrad Hilberry, 47

Student Freedom in American Higher Education, Louis C. Vaccaro and James T. Covert (eds.), 26

Student Politics in Argentina: The University Reform and Its Effects, 1918-1964, Richard J. Walter, 69

Students and Drugs, Richard H. Blum and associates, 56

Students' Intellectual Attitudes, Aptitudes and Persistence, Kathleen R. Mock and George Yonge, 31

Students Without Teachers: The Crisis in the University, Harold Taylor, 16

Study of the Establishment of Upper Division Colleges in the United States, A, Robert A. Altman, 42

Sullivan, John J., *Potential: The Academically Able But Disadvantaged High School Student,* 70

Sumberge, James H., *Grand Valley State College: Its Developmental Years 1964-1968,* 52

Suppes, Patrick, and Lee J. Cronbach (eds.), *Research for Tomorrow's Schools,* 64

Susman, Warren I., *The Construction of an American College,* 54

Taveggia, Thomas C., and Robert Dubin, *The Teaching-Learning Paradox,* 61

Taylor, Harold, *Students Without Teachers: The Crisis in the University,* 16

Taylor, Robert N., Jr., *This Damned Campus,* 69

Taylor, William (ed.), *Towards a Policy for the Education of Teachers,* 69

Teachers for the Disadvantaged, James C. Stone, 70

Teaching as a Subversive Activity, Neil Postman and Charles Weingartner, 63

Teaching-Learning Paradox, The, Robert Dubin and Thomas C. Taveggia, 61

Teaching Tips: A Guide for the Beginning College Teacher, Wilbert J. McKeachie, 62

This Damned Campus, Robert N. Taylor, Jr., 69

Thomson, Ian M., and W. John Minter (eds.), *Colleges and Universities as Agents of Social Change,* 9

Thornton, James W., Jr., and James W. Brown (eds.), *New Media and College Teaching,* 61

Towards a Policy for the Education of Teachers, William Taylor (ed.), 69

Toynbee, Arnold J., *Higher Education in a Time of Acceleration Change,* 69

Trelease, Sam F., *How to Write Scientific and Technical Papers,* 66

Trower, David L., and Thomas J. Diener (eds.), *An Annotated Guide to Periodical Literature—Higher Education,* 64

Trusteeship of Colleges and Universities, The, Morton A. Rauh, 37

Tussman, Joseph, *Experiment at Berkeley,* 17

Undergraduate Curriculum Trends, Paul L. Dressel and Frances H. Delisle, 19

Unionization of Teachers, The, Steven Cole, 33

Universities in the Modern World, Basil Fletcher, 10

University in Turmoil: The Politics of Change, Immanuel Wallerstein, 23

University on the Heights, Wesley W. First (ed.), 52

University Space Planning, Harlan D. Bareither and Jerry L. Schillinger, 41

Vaccaro, Louis C., and James T. Covert (eds.), *Student Freedom in American Higher Education,* 26

Vermilye, Dyckman W. (ed.), *Man in Perspective,* 11

Vorsanger, Fred S., and Julian H. Levi, *Patterns of Giving to Higher Education,* 41

Wallerstein, Immanuel, *University in Turmoil: The Politics of Change*, 23

Walter, Richard J., *Student Politics in Argentina: The University Reform and Its Effects, 1918-1964*, 69

Weingartner, Charles, and Neil Postman, *Teaching as a Subversive Activity*, 63

Westley, William A., and Nathan B. Epstein, *Silent Majority*, 30

What Type of College for What Type of Student? Albert B. Hood, 65

White, Robert I., and Ronald W. Roskens (eds.), *Paradox, Process and Progress*, 8

Willingham, Warren W., and Nurhan Findikyan, *Patterns of Admission for Transfer Students*, 42

With All Deliberate Speed: Civil Rights Theory and Reality, John H. McCord (ed.), 70

Wolfle, Dael, *The Discovery of Talent*, 69

Wolk, Ronald A., *Alternative Methods of Federal Funding for Higher Education*, 38

Yonge, George, and Kathleen R. Mock, *Students' Intellectual Attitudes, Aptitudes and Persistence*, 31

Young, D. Parker, *The Legal Aspects of Student Discipline in Higher Education*, 43